DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 480 SO 009 219

TITLE	Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales: Reviews of National Policies for Education.
INSTITUTION	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France).
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	64p.; Not available in Hard Copy due to print quality of original
AVAILABLE FROM	OECD Publications Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Adult Education; Centralization; *Comparative Education; Decentralization; Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Needs; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*England; *Wales

ABSTRACT

This report examines educational planning in England and Wales, carried out as part of the program of the Education Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) for the Review of National Educational Policies. The publication is comprised of three parts. Part one provides background information on the educational system of England and Wales which includes a description of administration and finance, educational planning, and teacher training. A glossary of educational terms is included. Part two is a report prepared by the OECD examiners on which the discussions at the "confrontation" meeting within the Education Committee in December 1974 were based. Part three contains the record of the discussions which took place at the Education Committee meeting. The names of the OECD examiners and the members of the special British delegation who took part in these discussions are provided in an annex. (Author/RM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124480

OECD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
OECD

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IN ENGLAND AND WALES

SP009219

2

OECD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REVIEWS OF
NATIONAL POLICIES
FOR EDUCATION

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IN ENGLAND AND WALES

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT
PARIS 1975

Price $3.00 £1.20 F12,00
(91 75 03 1) ISBN 92-64-11347-9

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) was set up under a Convention signed in Paris on 14th December, 1960, which provides that the OECD shall promote policies designed :

- *to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in Member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;*
- *to contribute to sound economic expansion in Member as well as non-member countries in the process of economic development;*
- *to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, non-discriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.*

The Members of OECD are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States.

© Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1975.
Queries concerning permissions or translation rights should be addressed to :

Director of Information, OECD
2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16, France.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface 5

Part one

BACKGROUND REPORT
(Prepared by the Department of Education and Science)

I. The Education System of England and Wales 8

II. Central control and local discretion in public expenditure 9

III. The range and scale of the education system 10

IV. The development of planning machinery in the DES . . . 11

V. The planning machinery in operation 15

VI. The White Paper of December 1972: Summary 16

Part two

EXAMINERS' REPORT AND QUESTIONS

I. The planning process 25

II. The White Paper: A critique 33

III. Final observations and list of questions 43

Part three

THE CONFRONTATION MEETING
16th-17th December, 1974

I. Introduction by the Chairman of the Examiners 48

II. Introduction by The British Delegation 49

III. The scope and objectives of planning 51

IV. The organisation of the planning process: Decentralisation and participation 55

V. Education policy-making in a broader context 60

VI. Summary Comments 61

Annex 63

PREFACE

The material presented in this report deals with the examination of educational planning in England and Wales, carried out as part of the programme of the Education Committee of OECD for the Review of National Educational Policies.

The volume is in three parts. Part One contains the report prepared by the Department of Education and Science in the United Kingdom to provide background information for the purpose of the review; Part Two is the report prepared by the OECD Examiners on which the discussions at the "confrontation" meeting within the Education Committee in December 1974, were based; Part Three embodies the record of the discussions which took place at the Education Committee meeting. The names of the OECD Examiners and of the Members of the special British Delegation who took part in these discussions are given in Annex.

The Secretariat wishes to express its appreciation to the Examiners for the effort they put into this Review; and to the British authorities for their frank and effective co-operation throughout the various stages of the examination.

Part one

BACKGROUND REPORT

I. THE EDUCATION SYSTEM OF ENGLAND AND WALES

Administration and Finance

Administration of the public system of primary, secondary and post-school education is divided between central government, local government and various voluntary organisations. Relations between these three groups are formally determined by law but much rests on consultation and co-operation both by direct contact between the parties and through Her Majesty's Inspectors, whose duties enable them to act as liaison officers between local government and the central departments. The universities are self-governing and their relations with the Government are conducted through the University Grants Committee (UGC).

The education system is not a tidy creation of central government and the powers of central government are restricted in important ways. Perhaps the most obvious limitation is in relation to the universities, which, although they receive nearly all their funds from public sources, are autonomous bodies and not subject to control by Ministers. And successive Acts of Parliament have placed the main responsibility for providing education at three levels - primary, secondary and further - on local authorities. The local education authorities build schools, maintain colleges of education and of further education, employ teachers, local inspectors of schools and education organisers; and provide equipment and materials. It is their duty to secure that there is efficient education at all levels to meet the needs of the local population, although what is taught is normally decided on their behalf by the head teachers of schools. Local education authorities spend 84 per cent of their total educational expenditure within the ambit of the Department of Education and Science. Roughly 40 per cent(1) of the cost is met from rates (a local property tax) and 60 per cent(1) from the national Exchequer in the form of Rate Support Grant (RSG).

While the 1944 Education Act laid upon the Secretary of State a wide duty to promote the education of the people of England and Wales, his specific powers in relation to local education authorities under that and subsequent Acts though important are not extensive. He relies heavily on non-statutory means of implementing his policies, by offering guidance and advice through the issue of Circulars and other documents announcing new policies or changes in

1) changed, in 1975-76, to 1/3 and 2/3 respectively.

existing policy, and by commending these to local education authorities and others concerned. If these measures are to be fully effective, they must be preceded by adequate consultations with authorities and the other educational interests and rest on some foundation of assent, or at least acquiescence. His policies are most likely to be readily implemented when they reflect some general consensus of educational opinion: for example, as to the area of the education service which should command priority for development or improvement at any particular time.

II. CENTRAL CONTROL AND LOCAL DISCRETION IN PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

Capital Expenditure

Capital expenditure by local authorities on building their schools and colleges is controlled directly through annual building programmes under which authorities are authorised either to start certain specified projects during a given period or to start projects of their own choice up to a certain specified value. The system can also be used to stimulate capital investment in specified directions since authorities can be invited to submit projects for inclusion in a programme with a particular aim such as the replacement of old primary schools. No grant by the Department is involved in these approvals, which are simply in the nature of a licence to build, together with official approval to raise the requisite loan. Capital expenditure is also influenced by the Department's exercise of a number of legal sanctions, e.g. those relating to the organisation of secondary schools and the setting up of new courses in colleges of further education.

Recurrent Expenditure

Strictly speaking total recurrent expenditure by local education authorities is not controlled by central government, since it depends on local decisions about the allocation of available resources among the range of services provided. However, the nature of the service itself imposes severe short-term constraints on the scope for local discretion over levels of expenditure. These derive mainly from its obligation towards children and young people - no other service has to cater for virtually the whole of the 5-15 year old population and for a large and growing older population up to the age of 18 and beyond. Moreover, education is a highly labour intensive service. Teachers' salaries and superannuation account for some 70 per cent of the recurrent cost of maintained schools: non-teaching salaries for a further 9 per cent. Teachers' salary scales are settled nationally and are legally binding upon authori-

ties, while other national agreements cover the rates of most other categories of local authority staff. Therefore, in the short-term, at least, local educational expenditure is determined largely by the momentum of the system. But it can be influenced, if only at the margin, by the generosity or stringency of RSG settlement.

Central Control over University Expenditure.

Universities are self-governing institutions receiving aid from central government through the UGC. Total capital, equipment and recurrent grants for all the universities are negotiated with DES by the UGC and distributed to individual universities on UGC advice. Therefore public expenditure on universities can be controlled in total by central government, but not in detail.

III. THE RANGE AND SCALE OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

Compulsory School Age

By Act of Parliament, parents are required to see that their children receive education between the ages of 5 and 16. Parents can choose how this education should be provided and there is no requirement that children must attend schools under the control of some public body. Local education authorities are required, also by Act of Parliament, to secure that there are sufficient schools for the provision of primary and secondary education. More than 90 per cent of all children of compulsory school age attend some 25,000 primary and 5,000 secondary schools maintained by local education authorities. Age groups vary in size; for example, in January 1971 the smallest was the 15-year old (649,000) and the largest the 6-year old (846,000); fluctuations of this kind from year to year (whether increases or decreases) have important consequences for the total numbers to be catered for, and (as importantly) for the mix between primary and secondary schools. The total number of pupils in maintained schools in 1972-73 was of the order of 8.6 millions. No charge may be made for tuition in any maintained school.

Outside the Compulsory School Age

Outside compulsory school age, only limited provision of nursery education is now available for the under-fives but a programme of expansion is under way. Beyond the school leaving age, provision at non-advanced level is made in the upper forms of secondary schools and in more than 600 colleges of further education, which are maintained by local education authorities and where a wide range of courses - vocational and non-vocational, full-time and part-time - are available. About 200,000 of the approximately

1.7 million students in the further education (FE) sector are following full-time advanced courses, i.e. courses leading to qualifications of a higher level than those obtainable in schools. Advanced courses are provided by more than half of the colleges of further education and about 65 of these have been re-organised to form 30 polytechnics with a major role in the provision of advanced further education (AFE).

AFE, together with the 43 universities (of which 8 are in Scotland) and the 160 or so colleges of education, (which train teachers) comprise the Higher Education sector. There are some 200,000 full-time undergraduates and postgraduates in the universities and some 120,000 teachers in training in the colleges of education. The "participation rate", which is the number of British entrants to higher education aged under 21, expressed as a percentage of the 18-year old age group, has risen steadily in recent years from 10 per cent in 1966 to 14 per cent in 1973 and should approach between 16 and 17 per cent by 1981.

Educational Expenditure

Annual public expenditure on education exceeds £4,000 million (at 1974 prices). This is equivalent to over 6 per cent of GNP and about 14 per cent of all public expenditure.

IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNING MACHINERY IN THE DES

A handful of Education White Papers (i.e. Government policy statements) and reports published between the mid-1950s and 1960s made valuable contributions to policy-making, but dealt only with individual sectors of the education service; as a result they did not measure competing claims on resources. An important development was the acceptance by the Government in 1961 of the Report of the Plowden Committee on the management and control of public expenditure. This marked the beginning of the present system of public expenditure planning - the PESC system, taking its name from the Public Expenditure Survey Committee of senior officials from Departments with expenditure programmes which prepares an annual report for Ministers.

The return of a Labour Government in 1964 gave new impetus to these developments. The new Government was concerned to plan national resources in greater detail than at any time since the early 1950s and to try to relate its own policies, particularly for the social services, to the likely growth in the economy. With a Government committed to indicative planning through the National Plan, the Department moved formally into the planning business itself. A small Planning Branch, staffed by economists and statisticians as

well as by administrators, was set up in 1967, and by 1970 some of the results of its work became apparent with the publication of two education planning papers. Educational Planning Paper No. 1 described the work done in developing output (programme) budgeting for the Department and included the result of a feasibility study undertaken in 1968. Educational Planning Paper No. 2 brought up to date the projections in the report of the Robbins Committee (1963) on the development of higher education to 1981.

The return of the Conservative Government in 1970 had important implications for the Department's planning machinery. First, the new Government came into office with certain political commitments, especially for the development of nursery and primary education, which marked a change of course from the policies of their predecessors. Second, the new system of Programme Analysis and Review (PAR) was quickly adopted by the incoming Government as a contribution towards decision making. Following preparatory work by a group of businessmen based in the Civil Service Department, the Government decided to introduce a PAR system so that departmental expenditure programmes could be periodically brought under special review on a selective basis. Essentially PAR is a means of defining objectives, establishing alternative ways of achieving given aims, measuring more precisely the cost of the various choices available and analysing the results of expenditure of resources so that valid comparisons with costs can be made.

At the time of these two developments the Department's Planning Branch was wound up and new planning machinery was established. It rested on three principles:-

i) Planning must directly involve those who must administer the policies that have to be planned;

ii) Specialist skills must be brought into the machinery in such a way as to ensure that they can make a creative contribution to policy formation without being able to determine it single-handed; and

iii) The planning machinery must keep close to Ministers, exploring, amongst others, options that reflect their known views and seeking Ministerial guidance and endorsement from time to time.

On this basis, the Department of Planning Organisation (DPO) since the beginning of 1971 has consisted of:-

i) A Policy Steering Group under the chairmanship of the Permanent Secretary, the highest ranking official in the Department, and including the most senior officials on both the operational and specialist sides. The role of the group is to determine the planning programme in consultation with Ministers, to trigger off particular

planning exercises, to ensure that the appropriate planning machinery exists for the jobs in hand and to receive and review the results prior to submitting them where appropriate to Ministers.

ii) Several Policy Groups, usually under the chairmanship of a Deputy Secretary, who ranks immediately below the Permanent Secretary, each directed to a major block of activities i.e. programmes and policies relating to schools, or to higher education. Each Group comprises a mixture of the heads of the operational Branches and specialists such as HM inspectors, statisticians, economists, architects and cost accountants. Each Group is likely to break down into sub-groups to deal with particular aspects, all groups being established as integrated multi-skill teams.

iii) A full Planning Unit headed by an Under Secretary who is ex officio in membership of the Steering and Policy Groups. The function of the unit is essentially to service the Steering and Policy Groups, to take the lead in preparing papers in close co-operation with the operational Branches and specialists, and generally to maintain consistency of methodology and co-ordination of effort across the whole departmental planning organisation.

The establishment of the DPO has been accompanied by development of the Department's programme budget. As mentioned earlier, work on this had begun in the former Planning Branch, and following the 1968 Feasibility Study a decision had been taken to work towards annual calculation of programme budgets to help in understanding the growth of educational expenditure. The programme budget has been designed to show the determinants of education expenditure - how much is needed merely to maintain standards in the face of population increase, how much arises from growth in the numbers choosing to participate in education, how much is needed to accomplish planned improvements in the system. Other analyses within the programme budget show the relative importance of various institutions at each level of education and the share of expenditure attributable to various resource imputs (teachers, other staff, buildings etc.). It thus helps to inform the Policy Groups about the limits within which alternative policies can meaningfully be considered. Furthermore the economists and statisticians supporting the Policy Groups are able to draw substantially on the work sheets underlying the programme budget to simplify the tasks of producing alternative expenditure projections for PAR purposes.

With this new machinery, which also improved the Department's capacity to respond to changes in direction of public expenditure,

and with the aid of PAR methods, it was possible to undertake a major re-appraisal of educational policies. This culminated in the document: "Education: A Framework for Expansion" of December 1972, described in more detail in section V. The starting point for the operation was the known political commitments of Ministers, but a variety of options was explored in the course of the exercise, and the package which finally made up the policy document or "White Paper" (see glossary) of course took account of constraints on public expenditure generally. Because planning must lead to decisions and decisions must be negotiated through the public expenditure machinery, the Treasury was closely associated with the Department's planning operations. So too, was the Central Policy Review Staff, among whose functions is that of challenging spending Departments to consider new approaches and alternative methods of achieving objections which their traditions of thought and procedure might otherwise rule out.

The White Paper was subject to a good deal of detailed criticism but most commentators welcomed the evidence in it of the Government's determination to review in detail something like three-quarters of education expenditure and to make clear choices affecting five major areas of policy.

During 1973, the Department's planning machinery was engaged in revising and extending the projections in the White Paper in the light of new data (for example about the projected school population and the demand for higher education). When the Government made major reductions in December 1973 in the level of public expenditure previously planned for 1974/75 it was consequently possible to try to distribute the cuts affecting the education service in such a way as to do least damage to the objectives of the White Paper. Thus the plans for nursery education, in-service training and teacher supply have been largely protected; and the curtailment of the rate of growth of higher education does not necessarily mean the abandonment of the White Paper policy because the latest indications are that the proportion of those qualified for higher education who wish to take up places is falling.

Several conclusions emerge from the development of educational planning so far. First, the practice of showing expenditure on components of the education budget to within £1 million up to 10 years ahead must not mislead anyone about the degree of uncertainty that must enter into long-term estimates of this kind. Although education is a service whose planning is heavily dependent on sheer numbers, and the collection of reliable and useful data has been highly developed, the degree of uncertainty and therefore of risk-taking in educational planning remains substantial and projections must be constantly revised and extended - as in 1973. Second,

because of the time-lags, resistances and frictions in the system, major changes of direction and pace can be achieved only slowly. Most of what is going to happen in the next five years is largely determined already; and in a 10-year look ahead the real room for change lies only in the second five years.

A final important conclusion to be drawn from the experiences since 1971 is that it is a mistake to confine too narrowly within the Department the thinking that underlies the plans before they are published. This is a particular problem of planning in the education service where the balance of power and influence between central government, local government and the academic and professional worlds is a delicate one. Ways must be found of associating these other parties and the local authority associations more closely with the planning process, the results of which are often vital to their interests. There are great difficulties about this - the size of the planning machinery that would be necessary; the increased area of potential conflict, making decision-taking on critical timetables more difficult; the responsibilities which Ministers cannot delegate; and the inevitable confidentiality not so much of the data itself, but of the economic and political background to policy formation. The development of participative planning is a direction in which the Department is seeking to move where it can. The establishment of the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers is one example; and the re-organisation of local government into larger units, together with any development of regional bodies that may flow from the report of the Commission on the Constitution, may in time provide opportunities for further initiatives.

V. THE PLANNING MACHINERY IN OPERATION

The major re-appraisal of educational policies undertaken in 1971/72 with the aid of PAR methods offered the opportunity to establish a strategy for resource allocation in education for the coming decade. Operationally, some important short-term decisions had to be taken in 1972, (for example, on the quinquennial recurrent grant to the universities and intake into colleges of education after 1973).

These decisions could only be taken, however, in the light of longer-term considerations. The decline in the birth rate since 1964 made it possible to contemplate both an expansion of nursery education and a reduction in the rate of growth of the teaching force in primary and secondary schools; at the same time the report in January 1972 of the James Committee on teacher training focussed attention on ways in which the quality of the teaching force could

be improved; there was a clear need to put on a more systematic basis the programme for the replacement of old primary schools launched in 1970; and the evidence of some slackening in the demand for higher education made it necessary to reconsider the estimates in Educational Planning Paper No. 2 (see section III).

Against this background the DPO spent most of 1971 and 1972 in a careful analysis - first, of the various choices that might be made within each of the main sectors of the education system (except the education of 16-19 year olds and non-advanced further education, which were reserved for subsequent study) and then of alternative combinations of them which might form a coherent policy within the resources likely to be available. For example, different patterns and scales of provision for under-fives (including the possibility of an expansion of the private sector or of the charging of fees in the maintained sector) were examined and costed; and alternative projections of the demand for teachers and for higher education were made.

VI. THE WHITE PAPER OF DECEMBER 1972: SUMMARY

This major re-appraisal of educational policies culminated in the White Paper "Education: A Framework for Expansion" of December 1972 (Cmnd 5174). This set out a 10 year programme for educational advance involving substantially increased expenditure in five directions, namely: a new nursery programme; a larger building programme for the renewal of secondary and special, as well as primary, schools; a larger teaching force further to improve staffing standards in schools; a new initiative to improve the pre-service and in-service training of teachers following the report of the James Committee; (Committee of Inquiry into Teacher Education and Training: Chairman, Lord James) and the development in higher education of a wider range of opportunities, including the introduction of a new Diploma of Higher Education, for both students and institutions.

In order to achieve a balanced programme of advance in the five areas the White Paper, designed as a framework for further action, laid down under each head the objectives at which the Government were aiming, the lines on which they intended each programme should develop, and the resources they were planning to devote to their attainment. The Government and their several partners in the education service would work out in consultation how the programme could best be carried through. But the strategy or general plan to which many diverse decisions spread out over the years could be related was not to be a detailed blue-print to be accepted as a whole,

announced in full detail and executed precisely as drawn. In almost all the major options there was to be room for a good deal of tactical flexibility once strategic decisions had been taken; and for variation in timing and the rate of progress towards the targets adopted in the light of changes in the demographic projections and in the economic situation. The White Paper emphasised that in view of the uncertainties of longer-term forecasting the Government must be free to vary the pace of development of the programmes covered in their review.

Up to the financial year 1976/77 the effect of the strategy on public expenditure would be almost wholly redistributive. Thereafter, there would be a substantial redirection of policy but the growth rate in education expenditure over the decade as a whole would not exceed that for the PESC period. Essentially, therefore, the whole strategy entailed reallocating resources to reflect changed priorities. Total annual expenditure on the programmes under review could rise, at 1972 prices, by some £960 million over the decade 1971/72 to 1981/82 from £2,162 million to some £3,120 million. The increase in expenditure on schools (including the cost of in-service training) would correspond to an annual growth rate of some 3 per cent, compared with 2½ per cent for the decade 1961/62 to 1971/72. For higher education (including the initial training of teachers), where the very rapid expansion of the 1960s involved an annual growth rate of some 6½ per cent, the corresponding growth rate for the new decade would be some 5 per cent.

Nursery Education

Within the next 10 years nursery education, mainly part-time, would be made available without charge to those children of 3 and 4 whose parents wished them to benefit from it. If demand reached the estimates in the Report of the Plowden Committee, the equivalent of some 700,000 full-time places might be needed by 1981/82. Some 300,000 were already available. As the extent of demand and its future growth were uncertain, it would be necessary to watch the development of demand carefully in the early years. As a first step the Government proposed to authorise special building programmes of £15 million each in 1974/75 and 1975/76. Total recurrent expenditure on the under-fives was expected to rise from £42 million in 1971/72 to £65 million in 1976/77.

Local education authorities in rural and urban areas with substantial areas of social deprivation were to be given some priority in the allocation of capital resources for 1974/76. It was hoped that all local education authorities would in their turn follow the same aim in deciding which part of their own areas should be given priority and also how far their admissions policy should give

priority to children with special needs. Many more qualified teachers would be needed and by 1981/82 the number teaching the under-fives might be increased from the present 10,000 to upwards of 25,000. The aim would be to employ a similar number of nursery assistants to give in all a ratio of 1 adult to 13 children.

School Buildings

An extra £10 million was to be added to the school building programmes in both 1975/76 and 1976/77 to replace or improve the worst secondary school buildings, comprising the first stage of a rising secondary school improvement programme for England and Wales. There would be a more systematic long-term approach to the renewal of school buildings, to prevent the accumulation of backlogs of obsolete buildings. Such a policy needed to be very flexible not only as between primary and secondary schools, but also to take account from year to year of variations in the level of basic needs and other factors.

The Size of the Teaching Force

School staffing standards should continue to improve progressively. The Government believed that local education authorities would welcome a broad policy objective of securing by 1981 a teaching force 10 per cent above the number needed to maintain 1971 standards. After allowing for the increase in school population and the increased proportion of older pupils, this would require about 110,000 extra teachers bringing the total to about 465,000 qualified teachers for pupils aged 5 and over. With about 25,000 teachers needed to staff the expanded nursery programme, and another 20,000 to meet the needs of the Government's policy for in-service training and the induction of new teachers, some 510,000 qualified teachers would be employed in maintained schools by 1981. The Government proposed that this figure should be adopted as a basis for planning. This would represent an overall pupil/teacher ratio of about 18½:1 by that date compared with 22½:1 in 1971.

In-service Training

The Government proposed to give effect to the James Committee's recommendation that teachers should be released for in-service training for periods equivalent to one term in every 7 years of service. It was their aim that a substantial expansion of such training should begin in the school year 1974/75 and should continue progressively so that by 1981 3 per cent of teachers could be released on secondment at any one time. This involved a four-fold increase in present opportunity.

Induction of Teachers

The Government endorsed the view of the James Committee that a teacher on first employment needs, and should be released part-time to profit from, a systematic programme of professional initiation, guided experience, and further study. The existing period of probation (normally one year) would remain unchanged, but, in future, teachers who had successfully completed probation would be described as "registered teachers". During probation teachers should receive the kind of help and support needed to make the induction process both more effective and less daunting than it has been in the past. Also they should be released for not less than one-fifth of their time for in-service training. For the remainder of their time probationer teachers would be serving in schools, but with a somewhat lightened timetable, so that altogether they might be expected to undertake three-quarters of a full teaching load. The raising of the school leaving age and local government reorganisation would preclude, for two or three years, a general start on plans for improved induction.

Pattern of Courses in Teacher Training

The Government proposed to work towards the achievement of a graduate teaching profession. They strongly supported the development of new three-year courses incorporating educational studies designed so that they would lead both to the award of a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree, and to qualified teacher status; the possibility of continuing for a fourth year to take an Honours B.Ed. degree; and the inclusion in the three-year course of supervised practical experience lasting at least 15 weeks.

The Government also shared the James Committee's desire to cater not only for the committed student but also for the student who wished to keep his options open or who embarked on teacher training but later changed his mind. The Government had been assured that it would be possible to devise three-year B.Ed. courses, where required, in such a way that the first two years of study could lead to a Diploma of Higher Education (Dip. HE) - see below.

Diploma of Higher Education

The Government believed that there would be considerable support for the introduction of new two-year courses leading to a Dip. HE with the following characteristics: 1) the normal minimum entry qualification should be the same as for degrees or comparable courses; 2) courses should be offered by institutions in each of the main sectors of higher education; 3) the qualification offered after two years should be generally acceptable as a terminal qualification

and in particular as a qualification needed for entry to appropriate forms of employment; 4) courses should also be seen as providing a foundation for further study and be designed, where appropriate, in such a way as to earn credit towards other qualifications, including degrees; 5) courses should be validated by existing degree awarding bodies. It was the Government's intention that Dip. HE students should qualify automatically (like university students) for grants towards the cost of tuition and maintenance.

Numbers and Costs in Higher Education

By 1981 the Government expected to be providing for about 200,000 under-21 year old entrants a year from Britain to full-time courses in higher education - about 22 per cent of those then aged 18 compared with 7 per cent in 1961 and 15 per cent in 1971. This would by that time bring the total number of places, allowing for older entrants and those coming from abroad, to about 750,000. They had adopted this figure as the basis for longer-term planning. The fastest expansion should continue to be in the polytechnics and other non-university colleges and by 1981 there might be 375,000 places in each of the university and non-university sectors in Britain.

If this expansion were to take place over the next decade, unit costs could not be allowed to go on rising and scope had to be found for economies. The Government considered that the future financing of higher education should be based on a gradual transition in staffing ratios to an average level of about 10:1 by the end of the decade.

Universities

The White Paper also announced the terms of the settlement which determines recurrent grants for each academic year of the succeeding quinquennial period. Provision was made for the number of postgraduate students to be increased in the new quinquennium by 7,000 to 52,000, representing 17 per cent of a total of 306,000 full-time students as compared with 19 per cent in 1971/72. At the same time, the settlement would enable the universities to increase the number of part-time students to the full-time equivalent of 15,500 giving a total of 321,500.

The Government had told the University Grants Committee that they would think it reasonable to plan on the assumption that 47 per cent of the full-time students in 1976/77 would be arts-based and 53 per cent would be science-based, representing a small movement towards the arts.

Polytechnics and other Colleges

By 1981 it was planned that in the non-university institutions in England and Wales there should be places for 335,000 full-time students, including 180,000 in polytechnics. Other further education colleges and colleges of education would need to provide for about 155,000 compared with 138,000 in 1971/72.

Colleges of Education

The Government's plans would require some 510,000 qualified teachers in the schools by 1981. The present growth of the teaching force was nearly 20,000 teachers a year, and there had soon to be some reduction in the rate of recruitment. It was estimated that 75,000-85,000 training places (including 15,000 as their share of the provision for in-service training and induction) would be required in colleges of education (and polytechnic departments) by 1981 compared with 114,000 in 1971/72. Some colleges either singly or jointly should develop over the period into major institutions of higher education concentrating on the arts and human sciences. A few would have to close. Others would be encouraged to combine forces with neighbouring polytechnics or other colleges of further education to fill a somewhat similar role. The substantial broadening of function proposed for the great majority of the colleges of education would involve their much closer assimilation into the rest of the non-university sector of further and higher education. This could mean that a college which expanded and diversified - either alone or by joining forces with a sister college or a further education institution - would not be easily distinguishable by function from a polytechnic or other further education college.

GLOSSARY

Nursery Education	- Education for children below compulsory school age (five).
Primary Education	- Education for children between the ages of 5 and 11.
Secondary Education	- Education for children between the ages of 11 and 18.
Further Education	- Education in colleges maintained by local education authorities for young people above the age of 16 (the earliest age at which children can leave school). Further education is provided on two levels, non-advanced and advanced. Advanced courses of further education are those leading to qualifications of a higher level than those obtainable in schools.
Special Education	- Education for mentally and physically handicapped children.
Higher Education	- Comprises the universities, Advanced Further Education (q.v.) and the teacher training system.
Colleges of Education	- Teacher training institutions.
Polytechnics	- 30 institutions, maintained by local education authorities, which have a major role in the provision of Advanced Further Education.
Local education authorities	- The elected councils of some 100 counties, London boroughs and metropolitan districts acting in their capacity as providers of education.
Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI)	- A corps of educational advisers and inspectors employed by Central Government.
University Grants Committee (UGC)	- A body established in 1919 to act as an intermediary between the Government and the universities. Its full-time Chairman and part-time members are appointed by the Government.

Part Two

EXAMINERS' REPORT AND QUESTIONS

Introductory Note

It should be stressed at the outset that the scope of our concern in this Examination has been of a less ambitious nature than the one usually covered by the OECD Reviews of overall National Educational Policies. Our interpretation of the specific task with which we were charged was to comment on the long-term strategy for educational development in England and Wales as reflected in the White Paper: Education: A Framework for Expansion and on the planning process which led to the formulation of the decisions and directions enunciated in that statement of policy. We have strictly adhered to this interpretation of our assignment and our report, which follows, must therefore be seen in the light of the limited context of the present Examination.

Whatever other purposes this Examination may serve, it has provided the Examiners themselves with a useful reminder of their shortcomings. We are acutely aware that we come from the outside, and that we have tried in a very short time to reach a just appreciation of institutions and practices that surely demand a longer and deeper immersion in them to be fully understood.

Our gratitude to our British colleagues is great. They have been patient and forebearing in answering our questions. They have been invariably informative. They have allowed us, at least for a while, to feel that we share a common business and a not ignoble one - the reasonable and humane charting of a nation's educational future. And though they are committed professionals and men with practical duties, they have joined us cheerfully, even eagerly, in the examination of their first principles. To all this they have added perfect courtesy. Our inquiries, we know, have meant for them the expenditure of time and effort. We have not been allowed at any moment to feel that this is so. The moment has come, however, when perhaps we may say that we are aware of our debt.

Charles Frankel
Reimut Jochimsen
Maurice Niveau

I. THE PLANNING PROCESS

Introduction

The planning in which a governmental body engages is not explicable in the abstract. It is intelligible only in relation to national institutions and habits and to an historical experience. Nowhere is this more obviously the case than in the United Kingdom, where government is conducted within a setting of understandings, restraints, and mutual forebearances that can only in part be codified. In Britain it is the habit of most people, high and low, to refer to "the long history" behind any social practice under scrutiny. Sometimes, in fact, the history is a relatively short one. Nevertheless, a significant principle lies behind this phrase, even though it is normally left implicit.

It is meant to suggest that a society has organic qualities, that abstract schematisms cannot be imposed upon it without running great risks, and that if its institutions are to be managed successfully they must be approached from the inside not the outside, felt in their concreteness and particularity, and understood as arrangements which people have worked out in the course of a common experience and which accomplish purposes too subtle to be written into a master plan. Accordingly, it is best for people inside an institution to decide what to do with it, and it is always dangerous for outsiders to meddle. This is certainly true for people completely outside the society. But it is true even for the relations of a governing class to those it governs. A government must get results but it must do so without intruding into or disturbing the structures and habits of its subjects' intimate lives.

It has been in these terms that the British constitutional tradition has largely evolved, and that the British conception of limited government has been formulated. In the eyes of most observers outside the British Isles, this approach to the art of government has constituted the essence of the British political genius. There are very few countries in the West - perhaps none in the OECD - which, at some crucial point in their history, have not turned to British political philosophy and practice for instruction. Yet the British concept of limited government is not the only reason why British political institutions are objects of universal interest. Britain is also the creator of a powerful Civil Service, and has pioneered for more than a century in the

public examination of social problems and the attempt to use the tools of scientific investigation, law and central government to find remedies for them. It is the country of Locke and Burke, but also of Bentham and Chadwick, the Mills and the Fabians. And since World War II it has been fairly steadily engaged in nationalisation of key industries and services and in centralised planning.

There is nothing in the British tradition like the Napoleonic idea of treating the education of a nation as though it were a problem in centrally organising the distribution of manpower and recruiting and preparing an officer class. Yet within their more diffident traditions of thought the British have been attempting to allocate limited resources to serve goals which involve the fairly thorough redesigning from bottom to top of their nation's educational structures. And although there is perhaps less tendency in Britain than elsewhere to envisage the transformation of human nature by new methods of pedagogy, the British have not lagged behind in the development and testing of new pedagogical methods and curricular designs. Modesty in the statement of educational purpose has been joined to accomplishment in educational practice.

For these reasons, an analysis of the educational planning process in Great Britain has unusual interest as a case study. Fundamental choices and dilemmas that planners face in most democratic countries are silhouetted in the British instance. In a single package are combined a sophisticated planning approach and a resilient tradition of limited government. In this setting planners must lead but they must also follow. They must be thoroughly professional, and also at all times in the service of the political figure who heads the Department of Education and Science. They must resist the temptation, and definitely avoid giving the impression of an attempt to control the content of education or the ultimate purposes lying behind its design. Yet they must allocate resources in accordance with some conception of national priorities and possibilities, and the line between doing this and making decisions about the goals of education is not everywhere clear.

The Power of the Department of Education and Science

The educational planning process in Great Britain is part of a larger pattern of received codes and mental habits. The result can be described either as a set of paradoxes or as a subtle blend of mutually supporting virtues.

At the start, one is confronted by the position of the Department of Education and Science in the web of organisations and agencies that have educational responsibilities in the United Kingdom. It is true to say both that it has extremely limited

authority and that it has great power. Although it bears the central responsibility for educational planning in England and Wales, and although it devises the overall plan, insofar as any exists, and takes such steps as lie within its powers to see that the plan is fulfilled, the mission of the Department is nevertheless a restricted one. Not only do Scotland and Wales receive their educational allocations through the special Ministries for Scotland and Wales, but more largely, the Department is prohibited from determining the content of education anywhere in the United Kingdom. The Government meets 60 per cent(1) of the costs of primary, secondary and further education, but the Department must leave to the local education authorities the final decision as to the way in which the monies it dispenses will be spent. In relation to institutions like the universities, the Department's authority is similarly, but even further restricted; it provides funds to the autonomous University Grants Committee, which makes the decisions concerning the distribution of these funds.

Even with regard to the need to provide for a measure of educational mobility and standardization in the United Kingdom as a whole, it is not the Department but autonomous professional bodies which make the direct decisions relative to curricula, professional standards, and the content of examinations. Within this network of local authorities, autonomous committees and professional organisations, the Department gives guidance but, except in certain specific areas defined by statute, it has little power of direct command.

In the distribution of teachers, for instance, the Department seeks to obtain a fair balance through persuasion and by indirect pressures on local authorities, rather than by direct fiat. A large consensus on a second best solution is preferred to an assumed optimum obtained under duress. Decentralisation of authority is characteristic of British political practice in general, but it is nowhere more evident than in the sensitive area of education, which touches the family and traditional mores intimately. It should be noted, however, that this decentralisation does not automatically signify a high level of participation in the administering and control of the system. The resulting virtual immunity of head teachers from external control, combined with the "liberal pluralism" referred to above, allows innovatory initiatives to exist side by side with the most traditional of arrangements.

This, however, is only one side of the coin. The actual powers of the Department of Education and Science are nonetheless considerable. Since the Government is the largest single source of

(1) Increased in 1975-76, to two-thirds.

educational financing in Britain, the Department's advice commands attention in any case, but it has powers that run beyond the purely advisory. It has direct control over capital expenditures at the local level, and thus has the final say with regard to the direction of educational growth. Further, its consent is required by statute in every case in which a local authority wishes to introduce or change a course at advanced level, to build a school or to close or change the character of an existing secondary school, for example by converting it from a Grammar School into a Comprehensive School The Department also controls both the size norms and the cost(1) limits for school building. This latter is an area, it should be noted, where major innovations and economies have been achieved in the rationalising of school building provision accomplished by the developmental work of the Architects and Building Branch of the Department.

These powers, taken together with the general context of the Rate Support Grant System under which local education authorities receive their subsidies from the central government and the control over the total supply and the allocation of teachers, show up the important role played by economic reasoning and resource control (both positive and negative) exercised from the centre in the orientation of educational action at local levels. They are enhanced by the fact that the Ministry which possesses them is staffed by a corps of permanent civil servants, well-trained and experienced in practiced efficiency. However restricted their jurisdiction, seemingly, may be, they do not waste what power they have. They exercise, in consequence, influence over the evolution of educational policy in their country at least equal to that of ministries of education that enjoy far more sweeping constitutional authority.

In sum, although the powers of government with regard to educational planning are formally limited, and British planning does not go so far as to be described as even "indicative planning", the central Department of Education and Science is undoubtedly the most important single force in determining the direction and tempo of educational development. It must adjust to economic and budgetary stringencies (such as those which led to the sharp cuts in December 1973), to opinion in the educational and political worlds, and to the pressures of organised interest groups, most particularly the teachers. But the evolution of education in the United Kingdom cannot be charted without placing the planning function of the Department of Education and Science at the centre of the story.

(1) Cost limits for school building projects were amended in January, 1975.

The Bureaucracy

Further attention must be given to a particular characteristic of the planning process in the United Kingdom which invites and yet transcends the term "paradox". This is the role played by the Civil Service.

The permanent officials of the Department of Education and Science, in the tradition of British civil servants, are non-political in their function. In no country, it is safe to say, does the Civil Service govern itself more closely by a code of loyalty to whatever Government is in power. The protections in the British system against the Civil Service's being captured by a political party go very far. In the Department of Education and Science, an incoming Secretary of State normally makes no appointments from the outside, though the Secretary of State in the present Labour Government has appointed an economist as a special adviser. Perhaps in no other democracy are ministers' powers of appointment so strictly limited. To the Civil Service's own code of professional neutrality there are thus added stringent safeguards against political patronage. This means that the expression of politically-oriented points of view in the daily work of the ministries is exceptional. Nor do the political parties intrude in the Service's selection procedures or internal communications. By means of these practices and traditions, the British nation has been served by a continuing stream of knowledgeable and experienced officials with a strong tradition for discipline, fidelity and morale, and chosen for their individual merits not their political allegiances.

But there has been a by-product. A permanent officialdom possessing such external protections and internal disciplines becomes a power in its own right. A British Department composed of professional civil servants who have watched the ministers come and go is an entity that only an extremely foolish or powerful politician will persistently challenge or ignore. The prestige, acquaintanceships, and natural authority of leading civil servants give them a standing in the civil forum often superior to that of their de jure political superiors. They are, in the continental phrase, "notables", whose opinions must be given special weight, whether or not votes in the next election will be affected. There has also to be taken into account the momentum of thought and action within a Department composed of career officials who have long known one another, who have the same training and prospects, and who work within a common tradition and point of view. An essential part of their ethos is to serve their "political masters". They interpret this as imposing upon them the obligation to remain at all times sensitive to the changing realities of political pressures and to

endeavour to identify in all situations a social consensus as to the priority issues towards which policy planning could be directed.

Accordingly, it is a simplification to describe the planning process in the Department of Education and Science as a purely technical affair in which resources are canvassed and strategic alternatives weighed, but decisions about ends and goals are neatly partitioned off, and left to the politicians, the electorate and the civil consensus. It is equally a simplification of course, to say that planning is entirely the Civil Service's doing. For example, the White Paper under scrutiny in this Examination bears the impress of the views on priorities, e.g. nursery education and basic schooling, held by the Secretary of State under whom it was written. It further bears the impress of long accepted goals in the United Kingdom such as the raising of the school-leaving age to 16 - something the British of all political complexions have contemplated since World War II, and which was in fact envisaged in the Education Act of 1944. Written under a Conservative Minister it received initial criticism by the Labour Party as a statement of overall educational policy; nonetheless this does not appear to conflict with the decision of the Labour Government to implement the main proposals contained in it. The immediate instrument of continuity was the permanent officialdom of the Department of Education and Science.

The inertial power of historically enshrined goals and the power of bureaucracies to guide the policies of their political masters are facts of life in all democracies, and in non-democracies as well. The phenomenon of Civil Service predominance in educational planning is in fact partly attributable to the circumstance that the civil servants in the Department of Education and Science remain within the confines set for them by law and their professional code. Their influence, like that of respected scholars or judges, derives from their justified reputation for neutrality and professional integrity. It might be said of them that they become powers by seeking not to be powers. But this does not make the role they play in planning any the less decisive. They do not make the plan in answer to their own beliefs and desires alone. But neither do they make it simply as passive respondents to the political process or the general will of the community. In sum, the cohesiveness of the Department and its enduring presence results in a continuity which provides a solid base and a guarantee of some stability to the other interests involved in the formulation and implementation of educational policy. On the other hand, the very clarity of its defined role has certain other implications to which we return later in this report.

Characteristics of Planning

Other features of the received structures and habits of British government are also pertinent to a consideration of educational planning as it takes shape in the United Kingdom. One of these, which is bound to strike the eye of observers from the outside, is the comparatively private character of the Department's deliberations regarding the plan. The Examiners have had the privilege of reviewing documents and studies (particularly the Programme Analysis and Review /PAR/ on Higher Education and Schools Expenditure) which give the evidence for the factual propositions on which the White Paper is based, rehearse in careful detail the options considered by the Department, and suggest the grounds for its final decisions. To us - and we repeat that we are acutely aware that we speak as outsiders - it seems that these excellently reasoned analyses would, if released, demonstrate to the public that the Department has gone about its planning tasks in an unusually responsible way. The habits of British government preclude letting down the bars of confidentiality, but it cannot be doubted that groups outside the Department believe that Departmental decision-making is not conducted sufficiently in the open, and, moreover, that secrecy at central level may impair the co-ordination between central and local administration.

The separation of the planning process from other forms of supervision and control is also worthy of note. No standing committee of the Parliament exists to which the Department reports. Nor are there formal institutions of consultation requiring officers of the Department regularly to exchange views with the various constituencies affected by their plans or to defend their decisions against criticism. Where basic questions of the plan are concerned, the principal means of consultation are informal, and are largely determined by the Department's view of its needs. The feeling exists strongly within the Department that when it comes to planning leading to policy decisions for which resources have to be secured and allocated, such informal methods, utilised by sensitive and fair-minded government servants, are superior to highly structured formal procedures which invite half-baked and politically sectarian opinions, and encourage demagogy, confrontation, and publicity battles, leading to a considerable waste of time. Widespread consultation could be more profitably applied to a different kind of planning input, as has been the case with the major educational reports of the 60s and early 70s - Crowther, Newsom, Robbins, Plowden, James and Russell - an unprecedented series of analyses and statements which constituted a formative influence on general attitudes towards the most important issues in educational objectives and philosophy.

This feeling may be well grounded, but the fact remains that the United Kingdom offers an example of educational planning in which the structures for ensuring public participation are limited. This has at least two consequences. One is that in certain cases policy is less likely to be understood and therefore less likely to be wholeheartedly accepted when the processes which lead up to its formulation are guarded as arcane secrets. The second is that goals and priorities, once established, may go on being taken for granted and hence escape the regular scrutiny which may be necessary for an appropriate realignment of policy.

This latter consequence is discernible in the White Paper's posture of acquiescence towards existing goals. The method of planning it evinces, as it sets forth its programme for the allocation of resources, directed towards effecting incremental improvements within existing structures, derives from the assumption that the basic directions of educational development are largely foreclosed: determined, one infers, by historical circumstances, demographic trends, and changes in public attitudes. Demographic trends and changes in educational preference are projected five or ten years ahead. General guidance is taken from the educational community's "consensus" on good educational practice. A judgment about the overall movement of opinion in the country at large - for example, that policy should be skewed in favour of the disadvantaged - is made, and the result of that judgment introduced as a premise for the plan. Finally, the probable availability of resources and funds is canvassed. It lies beyond the province of the authors of the Paper to query basic goals or new directions in education, except, perhaps, insofar as they create competing claims on resources or lead to financially unreasonable expectations. The question of the role of policy planning in appraising the controlling structures and purposes of an educational system and in initiating structural change rather than merely following or extrapolating existing trends thus presents itself as a major issue in this Examination.

This method of planning has persisted, even though in the 60s, as Britain reached many of its post-war educational goals and began to taste greater material prosperity, educational discussion came to be significantly influenced by competing educational philosophies and ideologies and by political divisions in society at large. It persists, undoubtedly, not only by force of habit but because it reflects the professional belief that the appraisal of basic ends and goals is not a proper business for a non-political planning group. Underlying this belief there may also be the classic notion that if intermediate goals are sensibly sorted out, ultimate goals will take care of themselves.

It is redundant to say that these ideas contain much wisdom. Nevertheless, a great variety of planning strategies exists that lie between the passive absorption of the Zeitgeist and the laying down of a master plan for the rebuilding of society. Planners may, for example, take note of incongruences between emerging problems and the received educational assumptions and structures employed to deal with them. They may set forth, from their professional point of view, alternative hypotheses for dealing with such problems, even while leaving the ultimate choice, needless to say, to political leaders and the electorate. In the United Kingdom, for example, the social costs of deciding to expand nursery education as against attempting to create new facilities to provide for the 16-19 age group are relevant matters for analysis and weighing. A fundamental question for the present Examination is whether this kind of analysis and weighing should have a place in the planning process, and we proceed in this light to a consideration of the White Paper as an example of the Department's planning procedure, concentrating on the weaknesses which have struck us while attempting to formulate our criticisms in a constructive way.

II. THE WHITE PAPER: A CRITIQUE

Introduction

It will be clear from what we have said above that, as a governmental planning operation, we consider that the White Paper and the planning effort that went into its preparation undoubtedly represent a most interesting and ambitious example of its kind, both in timescale and in scope. This is the more remarkable as it is not only concerned with a highly complex system of societal structure in which development largely depends on individual decisions and choices, but is also the product of a national political executive in a system in which policy and decision-making are shared to a singularly large extent by the various layers of public administration right down to the individual community, university, and - indeed - school.

It is obvious that "A Framework for Expansion" of the "British educational service" which is drafted by the Government must take account not only of the uncertainties inherent in long-range forecasting of political priorities, but also of certain responsibilities and weights that an independent body might have disregarded - though even in that case the price would be a loss in realism and validity, however much "neater" the outcome might be from the point of view of methodological coherence and comprehensiveness.

The aim of the remarks which follow is not, then, to evaluate the White Paper systematically and completely by the rod of planning theory, nor to question its status as a ground-creating innovation in improving the tool of governmental policy. Our remarks will rather concentrate on certain critical issues with regard to scope and coverage, approach and technique, on the omissions rather than the merits. We shall relate this to the special conditions created by the existing political and administrative structure and the planner's place in it, as these have been explained above - in fact, one or two of the critical questions arise from just that consideration.

Scope, Purpose and Coverage

The White Paper is concerned with "the British educational service". It is designed to provide a "framework for expansion", though it seems to be rather more a "framework of expansion" for certain pre-selected areas. The problems of the areas chosen are treated with admirable clarity, technical expertise and straightforwardness. There seem, on the other hand, to be certain other areas - such as provision for the age group 16-19 and for adult education - which have been wholly or partly omitted, without adequate explanation of the selection criteria and procedure.

At no point does the White Paper bring the structure of the educational function into perspective, either for the individual over the whole of his life-span, or for innovation to meet economic, technical and social change. We miss a balanced analysis of persisting and new trends in society, in technological development and the role of the State and of the place of education and science in the process of evolution. Consequently, the perception which comes through is that of a static framework for what appear to be arbitrarily selected priority areas, without presentation of the analysis or open admission of the indeed problematic nature of such shortcuts.

The White Paper is, in its own words, concerned with "matters of scale, organisation and cost rather than educational content" (p.1). Consequently, it appears to adopt the principle "more, not different", without due consideration of the fact that long-term planning exercises, such as this, as well as having repercussions in other sectors, are bound to produce changes in quality, in content and in standards. Thus, some of the main issues of educational goals and social purpose, e.g. individual promotion versus selection as functions of the age of pupils, the organisation of schools and of educational content - have been deliberately left out of consideration. There seems to be defensive strategy behind

this, exemplified by the absence of any comment whatsoever on the issue of the comprehensive schools for the 12-16-18 year old: it is, after all, surprising that a large-scale planning exercise of this nature should omit any reference to what was perhaps the dominant educational isgue of the last decade and one which is by no means extinct. Similarly missing is any discussion of general education versus vocational training, of recurrent education or life-long learning and of participation.

There is, in sum, no attempt at a new identification and formulation of educational goals in a world where the traditional canons of knowledge, values, attitudes and skills are continually questioned. There are hints to the effect that this might not be within the proper realm of government activity. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the Department has to be and in fact is concerned with questions of content and goals (vide the power of the DES in deciding the scale and kind of educational operations) and with optimising resource utilisation.

Insofar as the White Paper concentrates on the "educational service" as provided for or controlled by the Department of Education and Science, it inevitably gives the impression of putting forth a defensive strategy of departmental interests in this field. In fact, the Programme Analysis and Review document on which the White Paper is based disavows any claim to be "a synoptic review of the whole field of education". Though this document explicitly admits the interrelationship between educational and other social and economic objectives, these are nowhere instrumentalised and made operational for the active shaping of the educational service and system, for the extension of the coverage of this system, or for the diversification of the character and quality of the provision.

Moreover, the role of the educational system is not reviewed or related to the functions of different Departments concerned with educational matters, such as the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Department of Employment, the Civil Service Department, the Home Office, the Ministry of Defence, or the Department of Health and Social Security. Instead, the "educational service" is identified institutionally and equated with the services provided by the DES, in spite of the fact that the branches of this service cannot be taken as static and stable phenomena. For instance, the rapid expansion of nursery education may well create conflicts vis-à-vis other Departments and interests outside the educational field. In contrast, the approach to the problems of young people beyond compulsory full-time schooling is strictly passive: this may even be a case of conflict of negative interests since none of the relevant Departments appears to be concerned with the educational problems of the 16-19 year old.

The White Paper is a document addressed to local authorities and to the educational service. Furthermore, it is a document backed in terms of resources by the Government. But it does not address itself to the function of education in its relation to tasks such as vocational or industrial training. It seems surprising that neither the rapid expansion of resource needs for education in the 1960s nor the specific problems of economic growth and social progress in the United Kingdom impelled the Government or the other Departments to develop an integrated, or at least co-ordinated, approach to this vital challenge to industrial society.

Lack of Provision for the 16-19 Age Group and the Academic/ Vocational Dichotomy

It is stated in the PAR documents that the aim of the selection of priority areas has been "to include those [options] that represent choices of major importance which are, on a realistic assessment, open to Ministers and which would produce significant results from the point of view of resource allocation within the review period". One would have thought that provision for the 16-19 age group, in view of its increasing tendency to stay on in some form of further education, would have merited serious attention. Section 12 of the White Paper, "After School and Beyond", contains no discussion of relevant plans, although it does express, in a footnote, the expectation that the educational service will play a major part in the new Training Opportunities Scheme (which is being shifted from the levy-grant system of some 30-odd Industrial Training Boards, by sectors of the economy rather than by vocational functions, to a less influential levy-grant exemption system).

Figures provided to us by the DES show that in 1972/3 the proportion of the age groups receiving full-time or part-time education ranged from about 60 per cent of the 16 year olds to about 30 per cent of the 19 year olds. Of those who entered employment in 1973 about half the 16 year olds and a third of the 17 year olds were receiving formal training of one sort or another. It is estimated that of all the 16 year olds in 1973 half were receiving full-time education and about a quarter some kind of further education and/or training. These participation figures would decrease considerably for the age group 17-19. These figures are quoted here to show how significant the distance still is from the objective envisaged in the 1944 Education Act which provided for some kind of compulsory education and/or training for every young man and woman up to 18.

The rise in the number of births up to 1964 will, in any case, mean a high proportion of 16 year olds in the 1980 school population, even if staying-on rates do not go up. One cannot calculate

what percentage of this age group will be encouraged to go into non-school education. The sheer size of this group, assuming proportionately increasing importance and peaking in 1980, would lead one to support that its needs should be considered in detail. In addition, the policies adopted, or assumed as continuing, for this group will in any case have a considerable impact on both the sectors bracketing it, i.e. secondary school and higher education, and the plans for these sectors are correspondingly contingent.

The end of the compulsory stage puts a full stop to the education of most disadvantaged children. Therefore, a whole-hearted attempt to contribute to the improvement of this situation by educational services requires considerable attention and resources to be devoted to the educational prospects of those who leave full-time school at this age and enter the industrial sector where some vocational training is provided, but no compulsory further education, as is the case in continental systems, up to the age of 16 or 19. The exclusion of non-advanced further education from extensive consideration within the planning process contributes to the impression of the departmental and general education perspective which the White Paper planning conveys.

We understand from our discussions in the United Kingdom that the relative disregard for the issue of the 16-19 age group was a deliberate decision resulting from the concentration on apparent policy priorities at that time. We venture to suggest that this might be taken as an indication of the risks or limitations of a "closed" planning-procedure. During our discussions we were also given to understand that a reappraisal of objectives and structures for this age group has recently been initiated within the Department. The question, however, remains of how any decisions which may result from this planning appraisal, and which will probably involve additional expenditures, can be implemented over the next ten years or so, considering that there is already a policy commitment to devote the considerable additional resources which have been made available to the specific areas charted out in the White Paper. In fact, it is one of the strongest features of the White Paper planning that decisions, once various options within the selected areas have been carefully analysed and weighed, are backed up by a commitment to meeting their cost implications.

The omission of this area from the White Paper is the more significant since the choice of some sectors and the exclusion of others can hardly have been directly deduced from the very clear statement of objectives which is contained in the PAR document. A policy designed to achieve two of these objectives "to develop powers of reasoning and the capacity for adapting to changing circumstances", and "to provide systematic guidance and help so as

to develop the power of making informed choices", must specify the content of the "initial" and "universal" education of children, as well as the age up to which it shall be provided. How can such objectives be achieved without reference to, or outside the context of, industrial and vocational training? It would also be essential to suggest structural plans which will facilitate the prescribed adaptability, thus trespassing on the self-imposed restraint on curricula and breaching the constraint of present departmental borderlines. In other words, there would need to be recognition of the problems of the actual or possible polyvalence of education and training in terms of the skills and knowledge, as well as the attitudes which both should be able to transmit in organised pedagogical processes. "Educational service" as well as "general education" - in their purpose, method and criteria - should be understood not institutionally but functionally. Otherwise, one would be blocked from seeing both of them as component parts of one system to "develop the capacity for adapting to changing circumstances".

One must, of course, be aware of the factual situation in which this decision was taken: general education was to be raised to 16, and there was a long and proven system of ladder rungs through vocational/professional diplomas and degrees from local, area or regional colleges right up to the university - a system so "typically British" in its flexibility and empiricism that it is hard to describe as a "system". Traditional English trust in the integrative powers of community and society as a whole, beside and beyond organised education, may also come into consideration. Still the question remains whether society and, indeed, the economy can afford to stop educational concern for a large part of its youth at the age of 16.

Adult Education

The stated objectives of the educational process clearly include "to develop the attitude that education is a lifelong process". It is equally clearly stated that the planning behind the White Paper "refers only incidentally to further education below the higher education level and not at all to adult education". This exclusion seems to carry the risk of relegating adult education to a very minor position in the overall educational structure.

The educational service seems to be perceived as consisting of certain institutions offering full-time or part-time educational provision; consequently, the issues of paid educational leave and of the selection of target groups in society as part of a strategy for the extension of educational supply to minority groups, and such like, are not dealt with. One answer to this multiple question refers

to the unfortunately delayed Russell Report, another to the lack of funds. But the question appears not to have been thought of as being of particular relevance to the "constituency" of the DES or as being sufficiently urgently pressed by groups in society.

One may, in this context, also refer to the Open University. Its original aim was to provide an answer to the demands for adult education. As has been the experience with institutions aimed at similar purposes in other countries, the ones that were most eager to grasp this chance were not the most strikingly underprivileged, but the ones with relatively high educational achievement already, such as late drop-outs, or, indeed, former graduates of higher education. We understand that in its second phase the Open University is putting the emphasis on programmes designed for adults without prior experience which will increase even more the importance of this unique and admirable venture including that for other countries facing similar questions. In view of these considerations it is surprising to find virtually no mention of the Open University in the White Paper.

Binary Higher Education

While in the case of comprehensive schools the White Paper abstains from any substantive consideration, it states that the Government have "a contribution to make to the current debate about the objectives of higher education" (p. 30). It is here that the Paper is also quite outspoken on the system of units and credits as well as on the construction of university courses.

The absence of any statement on plans for the 16-19 age group makes estimates of demand for higher education more unreliable than they would be anyway. Admitting the need that in any long-term planning exercise some provisional figures are needed to be set as targets if buildings and staff are to be provided in time, it is nonetheless certain that such exercises should refrain, as far as possible, from plumping for exact figures and should instead concentrate on delineating the structure of future developments. The proposed cutback from 835,000 higher education students by 1981 in Planning Paper No. 2 to 750,000 in the White Paper(1) will take place entirely within the university sector which may create problems of selection and of binary balance. There appears in this even split in higher education between the university and the polytechnic sectors more of elegance and formal parity than of rational estimation of social demand or of long-term projections for highly

(1) This reduction, and the further reduction to 640,000 announced in November 1974, was based on evidence of a less buoyant demand for education than in the 1960s. But even the lower figure comfortably exceeds the Robbins Report's projection (in 1963) of 596,000 places in 1981.

qualified personnel in the State, the economy and society. The reasons given to us include the apparent coincidence of organic expansion estimates and wishes of existing universities.

The White Paper is silent on the long-term perspective for the higher education institutions under the control of local authorities both in terms of status and competition with other further education or compulsory school provisions, as well as on the issue of the viability of the existing rate support grant system to local authorities. The DES, however, seems to have become aware that political pressures will ultimately push the present higher education system towards a unitary structure, but feels that only a continued period of long-term preservation of the present structure will eventually produce full "parity", including greater similarities in status, which is a prerequisite to such a consummation. The university sector appears to be excluded from active consideration for various reasons, among them its sacred autonomy and "distance" from practical problems, while the polytechnics are considered as instruments for conscious shaping of future higher education.

This trend is backed by the handling in the White Paper of the future of colleges of education. There is here in fact a paradox in the general long-term planning perspective of the White Paper and the urgency with which the transportation of the Colleges of Education, and their effective affiliation into the binary system, is pressed. Local authorities were given an effective maximum of nine months to submit their plans. This may appear to be an unrealistically short space of time for such an important structural mutation, especially in the absence of an explicit background of the new institutional structure against which to work.

Innovation and Research

As the White Paper approach is largely restricted to quantitative projections and proposals for resource allocation, and is based on the existing institutional framework, it leaves little room for questions of educational purpose, content or method. Departmental perspectives, the self-interpretation of the role of civil servants as apolitical, or in any case neutral servants of the State, and the views of the content of education as a matter for local self-government, i.e. for teachers or local authorities, seem to preclude the possibility of interpreting the role of education as an agent for innovation and social progress. These factors also seem to inhibit any widespread interest in DES to foster research and experimentation for educational innovation beyond its indirect interest in these matters through the mechanism of the

Schools Council. It appears thus to be left entirely to the educational community and to the initiative of the local authorities whether or not they engage in these vital questions. The record of the system so far and its capacity to innovate have been good, as is universally attested; but the question arises whether the forces now at play are not such that in the not too distant future the need may not be felt for stronger involvement from the centre in the more esoteric matters of the educational process (including a more pronounced view on the promotion versus the selection role of education) similar to the one which exists in resource planning and allocation.

Improving the Quality of Basic Education

If there is one explicit overall priority which comes out in the policy enunciated in the White Paper it is that which relates to improving the quality of basic education. This is to be achieved by action in two main areas - improved staffing standards and teacher training and an expanded provision of facilities for early childhood education. In both these areas, the plans and the resources to be committed for their implementation are admirably elaborated in the planning documents we have seen. Accepting the essentially political nature of the decision to focus priority on these two areas, we wish to limit our comments to a few points relating to nursery education.

Though the educational justification for the expansion of the nursery sector is considered paramount, the measures proposed in this area are not seen as serving narrowly defined educational ends. The White Paper, however, contains no initiative for involving the whole range of agencies and services which deal with this age group - even though the need for such involvement is highlighted in Circular No. 2/73 which gives guidance to local education authorities on the implementation of the policy measures. There is the same constraint, in other words, imposed by departmental barriers which, if it had been possible to break, might have led to inter-departmental sharing of the financial burden, which in itself might have given more impetus to genuine co-ordination of a practical nature which this field, more than any other perhaps, calls for.

We would also have liked to have seen more explicit references in the White Paper as to positive plans of how effective links with the primary school are to be established. Without these the monitoring of the "effectiveness of nursery education in reaching its several goals", on which research studies are proposed, cannot be meaningfully undertaken. There are other aspects of the problem -

such as the relations between part-time provision and the consequent need for the promotion of part-time jobs for mothers; how demand will be stimulated among certain population groups, especially the disadvantaged, around which a discussion of the implications of the White Paper provisions for the Under Fives could be illuminating to an international audience.

Concluding Summary

The White Paper, as critically reviewed in this section, reflects an active bureaucracy, largely in the position to determine itself the framework and the nature of its activity. Within this definition of its role, the organisation and articulation of this bureaucracy are particularly effective, especially in diffusing the location of planning work within the sectors which carry substantive responsibility for the implementation of decisions. An effective network of communication has also been established within these various sectors, though we were not in a position to assess whether this network adequately covers the needs of the sectors concerned with the content and methods of education, except insofar as the interests of these sectors are represented by Her Majesty's Inspectors located within the DES. The chief features of the bases for its policy formation seem to be characterised by attempts to:

- minimise the degree of controversiality in the planning process and its results;
- reduce possible alternatives to matters of choice of resource allocation;
- limit the planning process to those parts of the educational services and functions strictly controlled by the DES;
- exploit as fully as possible the powers, prerogatives and responsibilities given to the DES under the 1944 Education Act;
- understate as much as possible the full role of the Government in the determination of the future course of educational policy and even minimise it in the eyes of the general public.

The preservation of this powerful position, by combining the task of coherent planning with defensive tactics, excluding an open planning process, public hearings or, even, participation, seems to an outside observer a mixture of strength and weakness. The stress laid on the "input" function of governmental policies, with matters of educational "output" left to others, and the emphasis on control rather than on identifying problems severely constricts the role which planning for education could play in the general social development of the country. Within this limitation, it should be recognised that one of the great merits of the White Paper

lies in its bold attempt to tackle the problem of the overall balance of resource allocation as between the claims of pre-primary, primary, secondary and tertiary education. One of the crucial issues here is the rate at which staffing standards in schools should be improved, since teachers' salaries represent about half of all, and 70 per cent of recurrent, expenditure in education. In this, we believe there are important general lessons to be learnt by close study of the analysis of needs - based on the triple objective of improved in-service training extending teacher training to three years, and reducing the pupil/teacher ratio to 18.5 : 1 by 1981 - which led to the precise targets laid down in the White Paper.

III. FINAL OBSERVATIONS AND LIST OF QUESTIONS

In the previous two sections we have endeavoured, albeit at a level of generality which we felt inevitable in an exercise of this kind, to portray the planning process operating within the DES, both against the general background of national tradition and institutions and in the specific context of one concrete and major example of its policy output, the 1972 White Paper. The effectiveness of the planning method is in fact to be measured not by some abstract *a priori* standard, but in relation to the concrete problems and pressures the planners face and, increasingly, the capacity of planners to anticipate and adjust to new problems in a rapidly changing society.

From this point of view, this Examination comes at an apt moment. British educational planning, like educational planning in most other OECD countries, is at a watershed. However considerable its demonstrated virtues, its capacity to cope with gathering new pressures and problems is still to be seen.

The British economy has lagged in its development. To the extent that this is due to educational inadequacies, for example in the recruiting and training of workers and managers at the higher levels of skill, large changes of a fundamental structural kind will be needed. The question they raise is whether planning that is essentially acquiescent in relation to dominant opinion is sufficient.

Ethnic and racial problems, and what in the United Kingdom goes by the name of "community relations", are increasing in severity in the United Kingdom as elsewhere. They pose particularly acute difficulties for education. Will planning methods based on informal consultative procedures and confidential determination of fact and attitude render these difficulties more or less severe?

This is only one side of the broader social strain which is becoming evident in England, as in other countries, resulting from

egalitarian pressures within static or near static economies. The trend towards regionalisation is one aspect of this strain, a trend which if it continues might lead to new configurations in the political map of the British Isles to which the organisation of education will have to respond. Yet a further sign of the strain is to be seen in the current difficulties with the rates system which threatens to undermine the capacity of local authorities to finance the educational services under their control. If this situation were to become aggravated, the implementation of social objectives including education is likely to require stronger intervention and support from central authority. The DES might thus find it increasingly difficult to preserve its present position of detachment with regard to purely professional educational matters, even within the context of its current responsibility for the oversight of standards and for value for money. It will be a challenge to planning how to reconcile the problems arising from the need for such strengthening of central authority with traditional local autonomy seen as essential to the British way of life and politics.

The role of teachers' unions in the evolution of educational practices at the primary and secondary levels is already considerable. It appears probable that unions will become more and more involved in further and higher education as well. The White Paper recognises that professional opinion must be considered in the development of an educational policy, and also says - correctly in the opinion of the Examiners - that it cannot be the sole determinant of the final result. Are the methods now employed for canvassing professional opinion adequate to the task of striking the proper balance? Do they permit the unions, educational officials at local levels and the planners in the central government to reach understandings not based on economic and political power plans? Can methods better designed to achieve understandings based on acceptance of common goals and constraints be envisaged?

Further still, what contribution can planning methods make to the resolution or alleviation of tensions that have grown increasingly characteristic of contemporary schools? These are the tensions between teachers who, on professional grounds, demand a free hand in designing the curriculum and governing the classroom, and parents and taxpayers who, on grounds of democracy and natural concern for the children of the community, demand a voice in school governance and pedagogical policy. The pendulum of opinion on these matters has recently swung rapidly back and forth in many countries, but it is unlikely that teachers in the foreseeable future will regain all the authority they once had, and it is possible that they will have less and less. In recompense, their economic weight will be great. Apart from presenting a strategy for the rational allocation of resources, an educational plan can

serve as a "third force" in situations of conflict, a rallying-point around which a measure of agreement, a consensus, can develop. To do so, however, it must be the product of appropriate public procedures. In what ways, if at all, will the existing procedures require to be modified?

Beyond these there have emerged other long-term problems in Britain, as in most other highly industrialised societies, which pose direct challenges to educational structures as they have been transmitted from the past. For example, the lengthening-out of youth as a period of dependency and the altered attitudes of the young toward parental authority and formal schooling suggest the need to create new institutions alternative to the classroom, to provide appropriate direction and training for some significant segment of youth. At the very least, the nature of the problems of "alienated youth" needs analysis from the point of view of its susceptibility or otherwise to governmental remedy. Even with respect to existing planning methods, better understanding is needed. Educational projections are currently being made in Britain, based in part on recent shifts in the attitudes of the young toward remaining in the educational system. But without better knowledge of the causes of these attitudinal shifts it is not easy to know whether they presage a new trend or are mere "hiccups" in existing ones.

Another long-term problem whose existence casts doubt on the viability of certain inherited educational structures is that created by the emergent "world of work". The need, for example, for the recurrent retraining of people is being met to some extent by industry and by the institutions for further education provided by public authority. But the recognition that recurrent retraining has become a structural requirement of an advanced technological society raises questions as to the content and orientation of primary and secondary education, whose function is different if a large proportion of those who receive such education will spend their lives unlearning old skills and learning new ones. Moreover, the relation of the school to other institutions, and activities in society needs also to be reviewed in a time when attitudes towards both work and leisure appear to be undergoing substantial modification.

What we said above, and in the earlier sections of this report, leads up to one final summative observation of the planning in the White Paper: given the vagaries of quantitative projections (exemplified yet once more by the recent school population forecasts, revised sharply downwards), we consider that an exercise of this nature, whilst inevitably built around figures - and we do not underestimate the need for quantitative assessment if only as a basis for altering priorities in the course of the implementation of the plan - should lay greater emphasis on the structural future

of education; that is, on kinds of development which will be responsible to changes in the population, in staying-on-rates, and so on, but which will be essentially viable even in the face of such changes. What we miss in this respect is the use of greater daring in the delineation of new paths of learning and of new institutional and administrative developments which would allow education to respond and at the same time contribute to changes in society.

Questions for Discussion

In the light of our comments we wish to suggest the following three groups of questions around which the discussion with our British colleagues within the Education Committee could be initiated:

i) Objectives

In the determination of objectives, how were priorities adopted and to what extent were those of the White Paper a direct continuation of previous priorities?

Has there been any significant change in the range of factors considered, in terms of the relation of educational policy to other policies?

More particularly, what were the reasons for the comparatively minor importance accorded in the White Paper to the needs of the 16-19 age group and to adults?

ii) Organisation

Within the framework of a national system, locally administered, are there likely to be significant changes in the distribution of roles between central and local authorities, in respect of either financial responsibilities or of responsibility for the initiation and monitoring of new developments?

More particularly, what would be the impact of any such changes on the organisation, structure and control of post-compulsory education?

iii) Planning Parameters

To what extent is planning seen as the projection of current trends and the consequent anticipation of their consequences?

How much emphasis, if any, is given to the delineation of possible new structures implying the purposive guidance of the education system in certain directions?

To what extent is the notion of responsiveness to demand interpreted to encompass the idea of latent demand or unexpressed needs?

What arrangements exist or are envisaged to enable educational planning to be more closely co-ordinated with that in other relevant sectors?

Part three

THE CONFRONTATION MEETING

16th-17th December, 1974

Opening the Confrontation Meeting on educational planning in England and Wales as exemplified in the White Paper "Education: A Framework for Expansion", the Chairman, Mr. Leestma (United States) introduced the examiners and welcomed Sir William Pile, Permanent Secretary at the Department of Education and Science, and the British Delegation. He then invited Professor Charles Frankel, the Chairman of the examiners, to open the discussion with a general presentation of the issues to be debated.

I. INTRODUCTION BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXAMINERS

Professor Frankel opened his remarks by stressing the limitations which had operated on this review. In the first place, it dealt only with the process of planning, and was not intended as an overall review of educational policy in the United Kingdom, and thus differed significantly from the general run of OECD policy reviews. Secondly, the review had been conceived and executed within a comparatively short time span, and although it was hoped that this had in no way led to superficiality of analysis, it had meant that the examiners had focused their attention on a limited number of fairly specific issues. The third constraint had been wholly unforeseeable: the postal strike in France had made communications amongst the examiners and between them and the Secretariat extremely difficult ever since the visit to London.

Professor Frankel went on to give a preliminary statement of the main issues which were to be dealt with in the discussions. He referred above all to the problem which confronted the DES of reconciling two requirements: one was the need to construct programmes for the future development of the education system that would enable rational decisions affecting the day to day operation of the Department to be made; the other was the need to consider what kind of future system was desirable. This raised the whole question of the extrapolation of existing trends and the weight which should be given to such forecasts.

The British system is of particular interest to other countries in the balance it strikes between the existence of a central civil service department and the decentralisation and delegation of decision-making power to local authorities. Inherently, it may be thought, a decentralised system lends itself to more participative forms of planning, yet one of the most important points of

discussion was whether the DES planning process was in fact sufficiently open.

One other issue had emerged as dominant from the discussions held by the examiners with their various respondents. All policy decisions entail choices about resource allocation, but the need to make such choices had been greatly accentuated recently. The question was therefore what effect the increased restrictions on resources had had on planning for the future.

Professor Frankel finished his introduction by warmly thanking their British hosts and the Department in particular for the co-operative way in which they had responded to the examiners' enquiries in London.

II. INTRODUCTION BY THE BRITISH DELEGATION

Sir William Pile, the leader of the British Delegation, began by introducing his colleagues: Mr. Jameson and Mr. Appleyard from the Department's Planning Unit. He declared that the Department had no complaints about the Examiners' Report and reiterated the fact that the examination concerned only one function of the Department's activities; that of planning. This meant that all the other functions, most obviously that of administering the educational services, would not come under detailed discussion.

He identified three major questions as being raised by the Report. The first was whether the Department's attitude, as exemplified in the White Paper, was too conservative and failed to give a lead in some areas of education; the second was why the White Paper was incomplete; the third was whether DES was too secretive.

On the question of conservatism, the first point to make was that the British approach to planning was essentially pragmatic, recognising that planners could not go against the tide of educational feeling. The Department saw its planning function as identifying existing trends, and then moving ahead on the basis of these trends in evolutionary fashion.

This does not, however, render it necessarily conservative and Sir William rebutted the charge of passivity by citing innovations which had taken place in the successive phases of education. First, in nursery education there had been an enormous recent upsurge of interest and the position had changed very significantly compared with 10 years ago. Secondly, primary schooling had been changing rapidly, especially in the development of middle schools which provided it with a needed link to secondary education. In the field of post-compulsory education, a great variety of provision was

emerging, the sixth form college being a conspicuous example. Finally, innovations were also be be found in the post-school sector, for instance in the granting of degrees from the Council for National Academic Awards rather than from the universities, and in the establishment and growth of the Open University.

Sir William summed up the character of the Department as being pragmatic, conservative and evolutionary, not theoretical, futurological and revolutionary.

The second question referred specifically to the White Paper, and asked whether it was incomplete. The answer was straightforward: It was incomplete, but was intended as such, and its limitations were acknowledged in its introduction. However, although it was a limited operation, it nevertheless covered the areas which account for roughly 75 per cent of total educational expenditure and its implications were therefore widespread. The five aspects it examined were those which required attention at the time and on which decisions had then to be taken. Three important fields had not been dealt with - the 16-19 age group; adult education; and comprehensive secondary schooling.

As regards the 16-19 age group, the issues were complex and difficult to disentangle. One unsuccessful attempt had already been made and there was no doubt that the Department would have to return to it. Adult education was not covered because a Committee of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Sir Lionel Russell had been appointed to examine the question. Comprehensive secondary education was not referred to because the then Conservative Government already had an explicit political position which it was not considered necessary to repeat in the White Paper.

The third question concerned the allegedly secretive nature of the Department. Sir William agreed that there was perhaps a case for saying that the British system of decision-making was very private, but argued that planning the allocation of resources was not an operation which lends itself to full and open consultation. However, this was not to say that such planning took place in secrecy, because a very important element in decision-making was the amount of time Ministers devoted to receiving deputations and in talking to representatives from a wide variety of interests.

Sir William concluded his introduction by pointing to three significant changes which had affected the implementation of the White Paper. The most important of these changes had been the deterioration of the whole economic background over the last 12-18 months, which had set tighter limitations on the resources available. Secondly, there had been a significant decrease in the demand for further and higher education. The third change had been in the demographic pattern; the result of the dramatic downturn in the

birthrate since 1964 being that there could be as many as 1½ million fewer school children in 10 years time, with important consequences for the scale and cost of the services that would have to be provided.

III. THE SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF PLANNING

Professor Jochimsen introduced this theme with a reference to the coincidence that he, too, had been involved in drafting a comprehensive development plan for education in Germany, for the period up to 1985 and he asked about the rationale for determining the time span covered by the White Paper. The question was, he suggested, to be seen in relation to the character of planning objectives and the way they were arrived at. If objectives were mainly determined by extrapolation of existing trends, 10 years were already far ahead. If objectives implied changes in structure and quantities, 10 or 15 years might seem a short period for planning in a liberal and decentralised system that relies on influencing individual attitudes and decisions.

In the context of the relationship between time span and objectives of planning, Professor Jochimsen pointed to two further problems. One was that, today, we knew less about the challenges of occupational and social life that today's pupils would be facing 20 or 30 years hence, yet the assumption was that we plan education to prepare them for these unknown demands. The other was a problem that had only recently become acute in most industrialised countries: not only had the future challenges become more uncertain but also whether increased educational qualifications would in all cases lead to the expected occupational and social rewards.

This was the individualistic aspect of the realisation which in terms of national (and OECD) policy said that "more education now" no longer equals "greater GNP later". The replacement of GNP rates by quality of life indicators as a measure of progress meant that education was seen as a social service. In the interest of society and of the individual, this might call for new thinking on objectives and indeed on the whole structure of education and its distribution over the individual life span.

Professor Jochimsen emphasized lastly that educational policy must be determined in relation to other policies and must take account of matters such as social mobility, employment prospects and the importance of retraining programmes. In the current economic climate there was, he felt, a greater need than ever before for close co-ordination of all Government planning.

In reply, Sir William Pile thought that although Professor Jochimsen had presented a persuasive case for officials to be thinking about and planning 25 years ahead, he personally doubted whether civil servants were likely to be better futurologists than anyone else. He accepted that such work was desirable, but the place for futurology was, he thought, in independent institutions, free of political and resource restraints. Civil servants took account of the results of academic studies, but it had seemed to officials in DES that 10 years was just about the limit for predicting, with any credibility, future patterns of educational provision. Even on this time-scale, planning was vulnerable to demographic changes which, recent experience had so clearly shown, could not yet be predicted with confidence. Consequently it seemed unlikely that longer-term (futurological) studies would provide a sufficiently firm base for the development of policy and a basis for decisions by Government. Rather, the role of the Department was to be aware of the variety of work being done and to draw on any that seemed likely to be useful.

It was not only quantitative predictions which should be treated with caution, since non-numerical trends were often equally uncertain. An example of this was the recent disproving of the assumption made throughout the last decade that demand for higher education was infinitely elastic and that any places provided were therefore sure to be filled. In fact the so-called participation rate in the United Kingdom, that is the proportion of school leavers qualified to go on to higher and further education who actually did so, had been falling steadily over the last 2 or 3 years.

Sir William emphasized however that to express scepticism about projections was not to reject them wholesale. On the contrary he was convinced of the value of such planning in the work of the DES. But it was important always to be conscious of the fallibility of many of the medium-term projections on which decisions were necessarily based.

Obviously, projections of trends are more reliable the less ambitious they are. The question therefore arose whether the Department guarded itself against the fallibility of predictions by being predominantly geared to making incremental changes in response to short-term trends. Sir William denied that this was the Department's attitude, and cited some examples of the way in which it had taken decisions which did not simply follow an existing trend. The first example was of a decision taken on essentially quantitative matter; this concerned the supply of teachers, and the White Paper's targets were set in a conscious and explicit attempt to improve the teacher/pupil ratio to a certain level. The second decision was qualitative. It was the introduction of a new

qualification, the Diploma of Higher Education; this, as a two year qualification, terminal but able both to be used as the first part of a teaching certificate and to be converted into a university degree, represented a new initiative in increasing the flexibility of higher education. One other example of the Department taking an initiative was the field of nursery education, where the White Paper was proposing some wholly new departures.

In general, however, Sir William argued that planning is a question of taking decisions where decisions have to be taken. The universities had to be informed what level of financing they could expect for the next quinquennium in order to allow them to get ahead with their planning; the recommendations of the (James) Committee of Inquiry on teacher training and supply of teachers had to be considered and the Government decision implemented; a decision on the increased provision of nursery education was needed because of the increasing pressure of public and informed opinion that a change in the standstill policy of the 1960s - itself determined by teacher shortages - should be reversed. In short, decisions had to be taken because of all the institutions which would not be able to formulate their own plans until the Deparment had declared its hand. These decisions could not wait upon the construction of a long-term and comprehensive plan.

On Professor Jochimsen's point about the need for close co-ordination of Government planning, he agreed that this was important - particularly in related areas such as the transition from school to employment. There was a limit though on the extent to which such horizontal planning was valid and there were growing doubts about the effectiveness of education as an instrument of economic growth or of social change. It was salutary to be reminded that the primary (though not the only) aim of education should be to educate; it could not be otherwise so long as an education system could not guarantee that every school-leaver was literate and numerate.

Professor Frankel took up the theme of decision-making, but posed the question whether or not implicit decisions were also being taken. In other words, the lack of a formulated policy on a given issue entailed the continuation of existing arrangements which affected individuals' day to day education. He cited the nature of secondary schools and the continuation of the binary system of higher education as areas where to say nothing was nevertheless implicitly to opt for a certain course.

As far as the shift to comprehensive schools was concerned, Sir William repeated that this was pre-eminently an area where the decisions had been taken for political reasons; the role of the Department in such a situation was to implement the decisions. He

agreed that conscious decisions about the future of the binary higher education system would have to be taken sooner or later; he considered however that the time was not yet ripe.

Sir William pointed out that he regarded the planner's role within DES as being concerned with policy development in response to manifest demand. The White Paper had focused on those issues which clearly were the subject of such demand; it had outlined priorities and had not set out to consider objectives in isolation. Planning could not be conducted in isolation; it had to be sensitive to prevailing public opinion. In practical terms, the nature of the policies pursued depended on the political party in power. It also had to be recognised that there were subjects which did not lend themselves to a planning approach - behavioural problems for example. This did not mean of course that they were not topics of interest to the Department as a whole, nor that they were ignored by officials. But educational planning within DES, he believed, should be essentially based on identified trends and on seizing opportunities for change when the time was ripe. He felt that he would be failing in his responsibility as Departmental accounting officer if scarce planning resources were wasted, for example by providing staff and facilities to plan hypothetical developments that stood no chance of acceptance or implementation.

Professor Jochimsen, however, wanted to know whether the Department was prepared to distinguish between catering for demand and stimulating the expression of need, since to concentrate solely on the former will accentuate educational inequalities. Mr. Frankel thought that some consideration might be given to the type of student entering higher education. Perhaps there was a case for an alternative distribution of these opportunities. It may be that we were too complacent about our present method of identifying talent, based on ability. Sir William saw this as a question of much academic interest but full of practical difficulties; there was a social judgement involved - and who was to say who were the "right" people to enter university. He reasserted his belief that manifest demand was the best guide to policy-making. He did however acknowledge that in certain areas such as vocational training, where other countries - Germany in particular - had done better than the United Kingdom in making provision, there was a case for thinking in terms of latent need as well as manifest demand.

There was one particularly thorny area where the problem of assessment of demand was a difficult problem: the 16-19 age group. The reason why no attempt had been made to define a policy for the 16-19 group in the Education White Paper was that the Department did not feel sufficiently confident about what the right answer was to enable it to pronounce at that time. There was a variety of

reasons for this uncertainty. In organisational terms, the area was extremely complex, involving as it did a great variety of courses being taken and institutions (many of them also used by adults) in which such courses were available. There was a serious lack of reliable data on which to base policy choices. Furthermore, there was evidence that adolescent attitudes to work and learning, and indeed to society in general, were changing and it would have been unwise to base any judgement on this without knowing whether the trend was likely to continue; a firm base was needed for a planning study of the problem. Finally there was great uncertainty about what content would be appropriate for the education of this age group. In citing all these difficulties the Department did not mean that it was ignoring the problem; only that at the time of the White Paper the uncertainties were such that it was not considered that positive solutions could be confidently propounded.

IV. THE ORGANISATION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS: DECENTRALISATION AND PARTICIPATION

In introducing this theme, M. Niveau raised four principal points. The first concerned the effectiveness of the links between the technicalities of planning and the political results obtained. He emphasized in this context, that he was very favourably impressed by the PAR operation. The second point put the question as to whether it was wise for the central government to delegate responsibility for and indeed control of educational aims and content to local authorities. Thirdly, he was interested to know how innovation was able to spread or be spread effectively in a system where the schools enjoy a considerable amount of autonomy. Lastly, where participation in the planning process is concerned he admitted that he was inclined to think that, to the detriment of the Plan, there was rather too much in France, whereas in the United Kingdom there seemed to be not quite enough. He added that as President of the Educational Section of the French 6th Plan, he had become aware of some of the drawbacks of excessive openness in the planning process. Given the fact that the education system in the United Kingdom is locally administered, he wanted to know what the attitude of the central authority is to participation in the planning process.

Sir William thought that the DES aim of striking a balance within the planning process between educational objectives, economic constraints, and political pressures was a realistic and effective one. He emphasized the importance of using a cost-benefit approach where possible to examine and assess alternative courses of action

and policy options. Some members of the Committee thought this approach might over-emphasize economic aspects, with officials acting in too much secrecy. On the latter point, Sir William said that a distinction had to be made between discussion and consultation on the one hand, and decision-taking on the other. There was a long tradition of participation and consultation in the formulation of policy before decisions were taken. It was well recognised that the thinking and rationale underlying new policies had to be understood by those who would ultimately be responsible for carrying plans through, and that little could be achieved without their co-operation. He was in favour of full discussion of the issues involved by all concerned wherever this was practicable, but always there came a time when the discussion had to stop and decisions had to be taken. He was sceptical about "mass decision-taking" and uncertain how "participative decision-taking" (as opposed to participative discussion and consultation prior to final decision-taking) was expected to work. In the end, only the Government could take the necessary decisions; that was what Governments were for.

Mr. Eide, the Delegate from Norway, was eager to elucidate the nature of participation and its relation to planning. He suggested that participation does not mean consulting people in order simply to integrate their views into a central plan, but must involve the delegation of decisions to them and the adequate previous dissemination of information to interested parties. He distinguished two interpretations of planning, the first seeing it as a matter of convincing people of a certain opinion, and the second putting the stress on enabling people to formulate their own opinions; the United Kingdom appeared to him to tend to the former interpretation.

Sir William thought that the United Kingdom followed both these interpretations; certainly, planning should not discourage people from thinking for themselves. But he re-emphasized that the main function of the DES planning organisation was to assist in the process of decision-taking. Of course one had to open people's minds, but there had to come a time when minds must be closed - in the sense that decisions had to be taken, so that discussions had therefore to be brought to a conclusion.

In part, the issue revolved around the question of impartiality and of whether it is possible for a bureaucracy to persuade the populace that it is behaving in a neutral way. Answering a question about the non-political stance of the British Civil Service, Sir William pointed out that of course civil servants had political views - as much as or as little as other members of the public. But in their professional capacity, Sir William argued that British civil servants could not allow personal political

beliefs to intrude; it was part of their job to obey their political masters, even when a change of Government meant a reversal of previous policy. It was in this sense particularly that DES planning was much more than a mere calculation of numbers; it had to be conducted against a wide general understanding of the goal and of the known views of striking a balance between responding to the political skills and convictions brought in by Ministers, and persuading Ministers to accept the Department's conclusions from its analysis of a situation. An example of such a situation was the discussion which took place over whether charges should be introduced for pre-school education, which raised questions of political principle and of educational effectiveness. The financial implications were examined but it was concluded that public opinion would have been opposed to the introduction of payments when compulsory education was provided free.

Questioned about the freedom to innovate, local participation, and the value of comprehensive schools, Sir William thought that there was a good deal more participation at the local level than was supposed. Every encouragement was given to local authorities to participate with others and to consult teachers about changes. Public opinion was taken into account over changes affecting individual schools by the Public Notice system which enabled local people to object to changes affecting the size, character, or closure of existing schools, or the establishment of new ones. There was a right of appeal to the Secretary of State. Since 1964, there had been increasing pressure for comprehensive education from those who believed that segregation was socially offensive.

Mr. Roeloffs, one of the German Delegates, inquired about the role of Her Majesty's Inspectorate, which, although responsible to the central authorities, functioned at a local level and presumably exercised considerable influence on the content of education, which is traditionally a matter for local decision. He also wondered whether the impressive work done by the several committees of enquiry such as the Crowther and the Plowden Commissions, had been followed up in any way, for instance by the development of a policy advisory service.

Sir William thought that the role of the Inspectorate had changed in recent years. From the middle of the 19th century to the mid 1960s, it had played a mixed role combining supervision, advice and pastoral care. With the development by the local authorities of their own advisory services, Her Majesty's Inspectorate had been able to spend less time on pastoral care, and devote more to acting as a dispersed intelligence system - essential to a Department which operated from the centre, without any explicit regional contacts. The Policy Groups within the Departmental

Planning Organisation all included members of the Inspectorate as well as administrators and specialists, thus ensuring that information from the grass roots was fed into policy planning and recommendations to Ministers. The Inspectorate's influence on curricular matters had continued at school, local authority and national level. Advice was given informally and, more formally, through assessorships on various committees - including those of the Schools Council; and through publications, issued by the Department, drawing attention to good practice. It was regarded by the Inspectorate as important that the advice should be interpreted according to local circumstances and was not to be regarded as obligatory.

To the second question, Sir William replied that the Central Advisory Council had been dissolved and that the Plowden Report on primary education (1967) was the last of the Council's reports. He agreed that the reports which had emanated from the Council had been very impressive and valuable. However, the belief that a co-ordinated approach to planning was more relevant to the Department's requirements than the piecemeal examination of specific issues in isolation was one of the considerations which had led to the setting up of the Departmental Planning Organisation; only an integrated approach could enable the overall resource implications of alternative policies to be examined.

Sir William mentioned first that the local authorities were responsible for deciding how much should be spent on education as opposed to other local services, and what the content of that education should be. Total local authority expenditure on all services accounted for over 25 per cent of the total of all public expenditure, and the sums involved were therefore clearly of great significance and could not all come from the form of local property tax known as the rates. He explained that the inability of the rates to provide sufficient revenue was made good by the central government in the form of a Rate Support Grant, which this year has risen to an unprecedented 66.5 per cent of the total local authority expenditure so that the Government had in effect assumed two-thirds of the total financial burden; the essence of the system nevertheless remained that spending was primarily the responsiblity of the local authorities.

The system of finance was currently under review, because the high inflation rates of recent years had imposed almost intolerable strains on the present system. Broadly there seemed to be two main alternatives. The first was to bestow on local authorities new powers of raising revenue, presumably through the introduction of new tax measures. The second was to transfer the financial burden in whole or in part to the central government and hence to assign to local authorities an essentially administrative role. Clearly,

there were significant implications for the balance of power between central and local government, and Sir William finished by stressing that whatever solution was arrived at must take account of the need in education above all to take decisions as close to the ground as possible.

A final point of discussion concerned the role of the central authority in shaping the content of education. As previously mentioned, the Inspectorate has exercised considerable influence in this field, but the question was raised whether the Department's present position is one of unconcern. As regards DES involvement in the content of education, Sir William explained that although the White Paper did not attempt to examine this question, the Department was inevitably involved. A new initiative had recently been taken by the establishment of an Assessment of Performance Unit within DES to undertake an assessment of the educational system and its products. There was some difficulty because of the decentralised nature of the system. Many decisions were taken by local and not by central government; but he thought it was right for educational decision to be taken as near to the grass roots as possible. On curriculum matters, the Government was - as was well known - traditionally excluded from curriculum matters, although the setting up in 1964 of the Schools Council for the Curriculum and Examinations, jointly financed by central government and by the local authorities, had provided a fair degree of impetus to curriculum development. However Sir William did wonder aloud whether the Government could continue to debar itself from what had been termed "the secret garden" of the curriculum.

In summing up the discussion in this section on participation and decentralisation, Professor Frankel said that participation is clearly not the fashioning of policy through mass meetings. Hence every country obviously needs a bureaucracy, and it is the tradition in the United Kingdom that the bureaucracy should remain as independent and politically neutral as possible. Sir William had described how Parliament had, until comparatively recently, had no explicitly deliberative function, but that over the last 3 or 4 years a system of Select Parliamentary Committees had grown up, composed of Members of Parliament and assigned specific tasks. One alternative, Professor Frankel concluded, might be to develop these Committees further into a system of Standing Committees of Parliament. Other moves - not mutually exclusive - would be to make the premises on which decisions are based more explicit, for instance the admissions criteria adopted by universities, and to make available to a much wider audience a fuller statement of the reasoning behind published policy conclusions. Sir William said that he certainly accepted the latter point.

V. EDUCATION POLICY-MAKING IN A BROADER CONTEXT

Central to the notion of planning is the allocation of resources. This involves not only choice between alternatives within a given sector, but also consideration of the relative claims of different sectors and the manner in which such claims can be weighed and reconciled, so that the policies devised to meet them are at least to some extent designed to complement each other. Similarly to be taken into account are the various factors which are not themselves concerned with education, but which impinge in some way on decisions affecting educational policy.

The most striking of such factors is the economic situation, and the way in which Britain's straitened circumstances may have affected the implementation of the White Paper. Almost by definition economic difficulties have affected the scale of the Department's activities, but it appears that they have not caused the White Paper's priorities to be significantly modified. In other words, the restriction of resources had entailed a slowing down in the rate of expansion but none of the new policies covered by the White Paper had been abandoned nor their relative priorities significantly distorted.

Professor Jochimsen inquired about the relation of educational policy to other policies, and especially to employment policy. The question was taken up by the Delegate for Sweden, Mr. Sandgren who observed that the refusal of the DES to attempt to harmonize demand for education with the constraints of the economic situation indicated to him the narrowness of its definition of planning. Sir William agreed that in this respect, at least, the Department's idea of planning is comparatively narrow. The Department was not itself responsible for manpower policy; and, apart from certain particular specialisms (such as teachers and doctors), experience had shown the great difficulties - and sometimes dangers - in seeking to tailor educational provision too closely to a precise manpower budget. There are, however, other areas which are more or less closely linked with the concerns of educational planning, besides that of the economy. The Delegate for Turkey, Mr. Ozdil, asked what instruments existed for dealing with problems of social inequality. Sir William replied that the United Kingdom did believe in using positive discrimination in the allocation of resources as a means of remedying social inequality; nearly every educational policy had this as an element. As examples he referred to the allocation of teachers - in times of shortage, areas in greatest need were allowed to recruit proportionately more; teachers' salaries - bonuses being introduced to attract more teachers to deprived areas; special grants to local authorities - for example where a high local immigrant population placed an additional load

on the educational system; and the provision of grants to students - so that none who were academically qualified were prevented from taking up higher or further education. He did not know whether the policy of discrimination was effective; it was pursued as an act of faith, in the belief that those in the greatest need required the greatest help.

Mr. Gass referred to the current debate within OECD about unemployment and to the potential role of education in relieving unemployment pressures. He wondered whether, in times of high unemployment, there might not be a case for more extensive use of teacher supply and for putting more resources into education so that adults could benefit from attending courses while they were not working. This would imply the reverse of the usual trend in times of economic crisis of spending less on education than in other sectors. Sir William did not agree that using teacher supply policy as an employment regulator made sense. The main hopes of combatting unemployment lay in raising the general level of economic activity, in directing that activity towards new growth areas, and in redeploying manpower accordingly. The United Kingdom faced the long-term prospect not of a shortage but of a surplus of trained teachers. Mr. Gass' proposal appeared therefore to be a policy of training for unemployment. At the same time, Sir William agreed that training people not only during but in preparation for their working lives was of great importance. More undoubtedly needed to be done on this subject in the United Kingdom. The DES, in collaboration with the Department of Employment, were currently engaged on a joint study of the question of "getting ready for work". He had already admitted earlier that this was an area where latent need was more apparent than was manifest demand.

The Change in the demographic pattern meant that there was no need for pessimism about the immediate future of education. A beneficial effect of the fall in the birth rate was that it relieved the pressure which had existed in Britain since the war as a result of the need simply to keep pace with the growth of the school population. The need now was to aim for a balance, even in the present lean times, to enable a smooth response to be made to any future demographic changes.

VI. SUMMARY COMMENTS

Professor Frankel began his concluding remarks by picking out one feature of the British planning system which could be regarded as peculiarly characteristic. This was its commitment to a maximum of impartiality in the face of a range of pressures which are covertly

or openly exercised upon it. Its functioning could largely be described as one of meeting demand, which emerged in a whole variety of forms.

He stressed that there were today increasing doubts about the effectiveness of education, whether in terms of performing its traditional, relatively narrow function, or as regards the achievement of broader social objectives such as that of contributing towards greater equality. There was also, he observed, a certain scepticism about the validity of much of current planning. Both these sorts of criticism might be countered by the British attitude of "leaving well alone", since the planning could be described as being in response to popular request rather than as the imposition of a design which might not correspond to reality, and since it by definition supported educational provision which was proving in some measure successful. "Leaving well enough alone" is, he concluded, an acceptable philosophy provided what exists is well enough and is not on the path to getting worse. But it is important to note that for a bureaucracy not to express its judgement in a certain area is no proof of neutrality, since it involves implicit support for the existing policy, or permits the continued absence of any policy. The decision to follow one of these courses entails an assumption of responsibility which bureaucracy cannot avoid.

In his conclusion Sir William identified four features of the Department's planning approach which he would regard as essential in any planning machinery with which he was associated. The first was its detachment and impartiality, which helped the Department to adapt its policies to changing circumstances, while protecting the educational system from undue influence by pressure groups of all sorts. The second feature was an awareness of the need for planning to be humane; it should not be a mere calculating machine. The third feature was creative scepticism towards over-confident predictions, seasoned with humility in the face of the future's uncertainties; it had to recognise that there are problems for which planned solutions are not possible. Finally, it should not simply react passively to trends; it was sometimes necessary to change events, and this frequently required courage to pursue consequent policies that were not always palatable.

ANNEX

Participants in the Discussion of this Report at the Eleventh Session of the Education Committee 16th December, 1974, in the afternoon

British Delegates: Sir William PILE, Permanent Secretary, Department of Education and Science

Mr. Richard JAMESON, Under Secretary, Planning Unit, Department of Education and Science

Mr. Edwin APPLEYARD, Assistant Secretary, Planning Unit, Department of Education and Science

Examiners: Mr. Charles FRANKEL, Professor of Philosophy Columbia University, New York

Mr. Reimut JOCHIMSEN, Staatssekretär, Bundesministerium für Bildung und Wissenschaft, Bonn

Mr. Maurice NIVEAU, Recteur de l'Académie de Grenoble, Grenoble

OECD SALES AGENTS
DEPOSITAIRES DES PUBLICATIONS DE L'OCDE

ARGENTINA – ARGENTINE
Carlos Hirsch S.R.L.,
Florida 165, BUENOS-AIRES.
☎ 33-1787-2391 Y 30-7122

AUSTRALIA – AUSTRALIE
B.C.N. Agencies Pty. Ltd.,
161 Sturt St., South MELBOURNE, Vic. 3205.
☎ 69 7601
658 Pittwater Road, BROOKVALE NSW 2100.
☎ 938 2267

AUSTRIA – AUTRICHE
Gerold and Co., Graben 31, WIEN 1.
☎ 52 22 35

BELGIUM – BELGIQUE
Librairie des Sciences,
Coudenberg 76-78, B 1000 BRUXELLES 1.
☎ 13 37 36/12 05 60

BRAZIL – BRESIL
Mestre Jou S.A., Rua Guaipa 518,
Caixa Postal 24090, 05089 SAO PAULO 10.
☎ 256-2746/262-1609
Rua Senador Dantas 19 s/205-6, RIO DE JANEIRO GB. ☎ 232-07-32

CANADA
Information Canada
171 Slater, OTTAWA, K1A 0S9.
☎ (613) 992-9738

DENMARK – DANEMARK
Munksgaards Boghandel,
Nørregade 6, 1165 KØBENHAVN K.
☎ (01) 12 69 70

FINLAND – FINLANDE
Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
Keskuskatu 1, 00100 HELSINKI 10. ☎ 625 901

FRANCE
Bureau des Publications de l'OCDE
2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16
☎ 524 81 67
Principaux correspondants :
13602 AIX-EN-PROVENCE : Librairie de l'Université. ☎ 26 18 08
38000 GRENOBLE : B. Arthaud ☎ 87 25 11
31000 TOULOUSE : Privat. ☎ 21 09 26

GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE
Verlag Weltarchiv G.m.b.H.
D 2000 HAMBURG 36, Neuer Jungfernstieg 21.
☎ 040-35-62-501

GREECE – GRECE
Librairie Kauffmann, 28 rue du Stade,
ATHENES 132. ☎ 322 21 60

ICELAND – ISLANDE
Snaebjorn Jónsson and Co., h.f.,
Hafnarstraeti 4 and 9, P.O.B. 1131,
REYKJAVIK. ☎ 13133/14281/11936

INDIA – INDE
Oxford Book and Stationery Co.
NEW DELHI, Scindia House. ☎ 47388
CALCUTTA, 17 Park Street. ☎ 24083

IRELAND – IRLANDE
Eason and Son, 40 Lower O'Connell Street,
P.O.B. 42, DUBLIN 1. ☎ 01-41161

ISRAEL
Emanuel Brown
35 Allenby Road, TEL AVIV. ☎ 51049/54082
also at
9, Shlomzion Hamalka Street, JERUSALEM
☎ 234807
48 Nahlath Benjamin Street, TEL AVIV
☎ 53276

ITALY – ITALIE
Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni
Via Lamarmora 45, 50121 FIRENZE. ☎ 579751
Via Bartolini 29, 20155 MILANO. ☎ 365083
Sous-dépositaires :
Editrice e Libreria Herder,
Piazza Montecitorio 120, 00186 ROMA.
☎ 674628
Libreria Hoepli, Via Hoepli 5, 20121 MILANO.
☎ 865446
Libreria Lattes, Via Garibaldi 3, 10122 TORINO.
☎ 519274
La diffusione delle edizioni OCDE è inoltre assicurata dalle migliori librerie nelle città più importanti.

JAPAN – JAPON
OECD Publications Centre,
Akasaka Park Building,
2-3-4 Akasaka,
Minato-ku
TOKYO 107. ☎ 586-2016
Maruzen Company Ltd.,
6 Tori-Nichome Nihonbashi, TOKYO 103,
P.O.B. 5050, Tokyo International 100-31.
☎ 272-7211

LEBANON – LIBAN
Documenta Scientifica/Redico
Edison Building, Bliss Street,
P.O. Box 5641, BEIRUT. ☎ 354429 – 344425

THE NETHERLANDS – PAYS-BAS
W.P. Van Stockum
Buitenhof 36, DEN HAAG. ☎ 070-65.68.08

NEW ZEALAND – NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
The Publications Officer
Government Printing Office
Mulgrave Street (Private Bag)
WELLINGTON. ☎ 46 807
and Government Bookshops at
AUCKLAND (P.O.B. 5344). ☎ 32 919
CHRISTCHURCH (P.O.B. 1721). ☎ 50 331
HAMILTON (P.O.B. 857). ☎ 80 103
DUNEDIN (P.O.B. 1104). ☎ 78 294

NORWAY – NORVEGE
Johan Grundt Tanums Bokhandel,
Karl Johansgate 41/43, OSLO 1. ☎ 02-332980

PAKISTAN
Mirza Book Agency, 65 Shahrah Quaid-E-Azam,
LAHORE 3. ☎ 66839

PHILIPPINES
R.M. Garcia Publishing House,
903 Quezon Blvd. Ext., QUEZON CITY,
P.O. Box 1860 – MANILA. ☎ 99.98.47

PORTUGAL
Livraria Portugal,
Rua do Carmo 70-74, LISBOA 2. ☎ 360582/3

SPAIN – ESPAGNE
Libreria Mundi Prensa
Castelló 37, MADRID-1. ☎ 275 46 55
Libreria Bastinos,
Pelayo, 52, BARCELONA 1. ☎ 222 06 00

SWEDEN – SUEDE
Fritzes Kungl. Hovbokhandel,
Fredsgatan 2, 11152 STOCKHOLM 16.
☎ 08/23 89 00

SWITZERLAND – SUISSE
Librairie Payot, 6 rue Grenus, 1211 GENEVE 11.
☎ 022-31 89 50

TAIWAN
Books and Scientific Supplies Services, Ltd.
P.O.B. 83, TAIPEI.

TURKEY – TURQUIE
Librairie Hachette,
469 Istiklal Caddesi,
Beyoglu, ISTANBUL. ☎ 44 94 70
et 14 E Ziya Gokalp Caddesi
ANKARA. ☎ 12 10 80

UNITED KINGDOM – ROYAUME-UNI
H.M. Stationery Office, P.O.B. 569, LONDON
SE1 9NH. ☎ 01-928-6977, Ext. 410
or
49 High Holborn
LONDON WC1V 6HB (personal callers)
Branches at : EDINBURGH, BIRMINGHAM, BRISTOL, MANCHESTER, CARDIFF, BELFAST.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OECD Publications Center, Suite 1207,
1750 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 ☎ (202)298-8755

VENEZUELA
Libreria del Este, Avda. F. Miranda 52,
Edificio Galipán, Apido. 60 337, CARACAS 106.
☎ 32 23 01/33 26 04/33 24 73

YUGOSLAVIA – YOUGOSLAVIE
Jugoslovenska Knjiga, Terazije 27, P.O.B. 36,
BEOGRAD. ☎ 621-992

Les commandes provenant de pays où l'OCDE n'a pas encore désigné de dépositaire peuvent être adressées à :
OCDE, Bureau des Publications, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16
Orders and inquiries from countries where sales agents have not yet been appointed may be sent to :
OECD, Publications Office, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16

OECD PUBLICATIONS, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16 - No. 34.977 1975
PRINTED IN FRANCE